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AGENDA

1. To report apologies for absence;

2. Any items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as matters of urgency pursuant to Section 100 B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act, 1972; [Urgent business may only be taken if, "by reason of special circumstances" (which will be recorded in the minutes), the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered as a matter of urgency.]

3. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members;
   (Please see guidance form and flow chart attached - page 4)

4. Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 30 April 2012;    (attached – page 6 )

5. South Norfolk Council’s Site Specific Policies and Allocations Development Plan Document: Preferred Options (Part 3);  (report attached – page 18)
   Please see Council’s website to see details of the proposed sites http://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/democracy/default.aspx

   (Appendix A enclosed separately)
   To agree the proposed list of topics and policies to be included in the draft Development Management Policies Document

7. Wymondham 2026 – Shaping the future development of your town
   Vision and Objectives;  (report attached – page 54 )
   (Appendix 1 enclosed separately)

   The Council is preparing an Area Action Plan (AAP) for Wymondham to bring forward the growth identified in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The AAP is an opportunity to plan for housing, jobs, services, infrastructure and community benefits in Wymondham in a co-ordinated way. The Council consulted on the first stage of preparing the AAP between 23 January and 16 March 2012. The aim of this stage of consultation was to gather people’s views about future development in Wymondham. The results of the consultation have now been used to develop a Vision and Objectives for the AAP. Cabinet is recommended to approve the attached Vision and Objectives and to instruct officers to proceed with production of a more detailed Preferred Options document for public consultation in autumn 2012.

   (report attached – page 69)

   This report recommends a suggested response to Norfolk County Council’s publication of its Pre-Submission versions of its Minerals and Waste Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Documents.

9. Cabinet Policy Committees – Future Work Programme;

   (report attached – page 90)

   On 21 May 2012, Council approved a new Committee structure for South Norfolk Council. This structure introduced Cabinet Policy Committees, under the Chairmanship of the Deputy Cabinet Members, whose role is primarily to support the development of policy and perform in-depth review of Council performance.

   The terms of reference for the Policy Committees make clear that it is for Cabinet to direct the work of the Committees. This report sets out an initial work programme for the Policy Committees over the forthcoming year, for Cabinet to then review and approve.

10. Variations to Section 106 Agreements – Discounted Market Sale;

    This report has been withdrawn because has become clear that the problem of mortgage lenders not accepting Discounted Mortgage Sale as a mortgagable form of tenure is wider than the specific case that resulted in the request for this report. Research to date suggests that this is not a situation that is likely to resolve itself in the short-term and officers are therefore seeking a more elegant solution that will avoid further case by case action. Not bringing the report forward at this time will not affect the home owner in question.

    Andy Jarvis
    Director of Development and Environment

11. Cabinet Core Agenda;

    (attached – page 98)
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

When declaring an interest at a meeting Members are asked to indicate whether the interest is a personal one only or one which is also prejudicial. The declaration should indicate the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates. In the case of a personal interest, the member may speak and vote. If it is a prejudicial interest, a member has the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public but must then withdraw from the meeting. A member can participate fully where the interest is shared with the majority of residents in that particular ward. Members are also requested when appropriate to make any declarations under the Code of Practice on Planning and Judicial matters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is (or should) the Interest be registered in the Register of Members' Interests?</th>
<th>If not, whose well being or financial position is affected to a greater extent than the majority of other people in the ward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your own</td>
<td>A family member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any person or body who has employed or appointed your family member/close associate</td>
<td>Any firm in which your family member/close associate is a partner or company of which they are directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any of the following in which you hold a position of general control or management: outside organisations, other public authorities, charities, pressure groups, political parties or trade unions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the interest:

- (a) affect your financial position or the financial position of a person or body described above? **(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)**

- (b) relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or any person or body described above? **(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)**

- (c) relate to scrutiny by the Overview and Scrutiny committee of a decision you were party to? **(If Yes the interest is prejudicial)**

- (d) relate to the functions of the council in respect of housing (except your tenancy), statutory sick pay, an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members, any ceremonial honour given to members, or setting the council tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992. **(If Yes the interest is NOT PREJUDICIAL)**

**PREJUDICIAL INTEREST**

If you answered Yes to (a) or (b) is the interest one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest? **If Yes the interest is PREJUDICIAL**

If you answered Yes to (c) the interest is PREJUDICIAL

If prejudicial do you intend to attend the meeting to make representations, answer questions or give evidence?

FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE FLOWCHART OVERLEAF
DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to my interests?

A
Does it affect my entries in the Register of Interests?

OR

B
Does it affect the well being or financial position of me, my family or close associates; or my family’s or close associates’
- employment, employers or businesses;
- companies in which they are a director or where they have a shareholding of more than £25,000 face value;
- business partnerships; or
C
Does it affect the well being or financial position of the following organisations in which I hold a position of general control or management:
- other bodies to which I have been appointed or nominated by the council;
- other public authorities;
- charitable bodies;
- bodies whose main purpose is to influence public opinion or policy

More than the majority of other people in the ward?

D
Is Overview and Scrutiny considering a decision I made? If so you have a prejudicial interest.

The interest is prejudicial you can participate in the meeting and vote

Is the interest financial or relating to a regulatory issue e.g. planning permission?

NO

The interest is not prejudicial you can participate in the meeting and vote

YES

You may have a prejudicial interest

NO

Would a member of the public – if he or she knew all the facts – reasonably think that personal interest was so significant that my decision on the matter would be affected by it?

NO

The interest is prejudicial withdraw from the meeting by leaving the room (after making representations, answering questions or giving evidence). Do not try to improperly influence the decision

YES

This matter relates to
- housing (except your tenancy)
- statutory sick pay from the council
- an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members
- any ceremonial honour given to members
- setting the council tax or a precept

NO

The interest is prejudicial withdraw from the meeting by leaving the room (after making representations, answering questions or giving evidence). Do not try to improperly influence the decision

YES

Would a member of the public – if he or she knew all the facts – reasonably think that personal interest was so significant that my decision on the matter would be affected by it?

NO

The interest is prejudicial withdraw from the meeting by leaving the room (after making representations, answering questions or giving evidence). Do not try to improperly influence the decision

YES

Would a member of the public – if he or she knew all the facts – reasonably think that personal interest was so significant that my decision on the matter would be affected by it?
South Norfolk Council’s Site Specific Policies and Allocations Development Plan Document; Preferred Options (part 3)

Planning Policy Manager

The Site Specific Policies and Allocations Development Plan Document is an important part of the Council’s Local Plan as it sets out the areas of land being proposed for development. Having completed two periods of public consultation and having assessed sites, this report recommends publishing the sites that have the best results as the Council’s preferred options for settlements in the Norwich Policy Area (excluding Cringleford, Long Stratton and Wymondham, which will be covered by separate planning policy documents). These allocations will meet the requirements of the Joint Core Strategy, and will be published in September 2012 for a further period of eight weeks consultation.

Cabinet member(s): John Fuller
Ward(s) affected: All

Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail: Tim Horspole 015080533806 thorspole@s-norfolk.gov.uk

1. Background

1.1. The Site Specific Policies and Allocations Development Plan will set out where new homes and employment sites will be located over the next 15 years to meet the growth in accordance with the pattern of development in South Norfolk set out in the Joint Core Strategy. It will include policies which determine what is required in infrastructure, road/access and other improvements, for the allocated sites to be developed. It will also show development boundaries in the larger villages and service centres. Two previous consultations have been held as part of the preparation of this document. In Autumn 2010 the Council consulted residents on over 1,500 sites suggested by landowners and developers. We have received nearly 7,000 comments which helped the Council focus on the key issues when assessing the suitability of proposed sites. A further 147 sites were also suggested to us at this time by landowners and developers and these were published and consulted on in Autumn 2011. This was a further opportunity for those who missed the first consultation to give their views on all of the sites suggested to the Council and to give views on specific suggested policy wording.

1.2. Our last consultation resulted in a further 4,000 comments, which were very useful and we are grateful to all residents who took the time to take part in the process. These comments have helped us develop and shape the objectives of the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD and the Preferred Options we are
presenting. The consultation also brought a further 74 suggested sites for us to consider. These sites have been included in our site assessment process and we have sought initial views on these from specific consultees where they performed well in the assessment criteria.

1.3. So in total 1,300 sites have been considered. Until this point, the Council has been careful to remain neutral as to whether it favours a particular site or not. It has been for developers to propose sites and for local people and statutory consultees to draw attention to reasons for or against the inclusion of individual proposals. That stance now changes and the Council is publishing those sites it considers are most appropriate.

1.4. In aggregate, the amount of land proposed for housing has been sufficient to provide for over 150,000 houses at typical densities. We have been over-subscribed for land by fifteen to one. So it is inevitable that some promoters will be disappointed that their site has not been chosen. The Council has a responsibility to scale back developers ambition to the extent that it matches likely housing demand during the nominal plan period to 2026 and where sites are chosen, they are realistically developable and on hand to services people value like education facilities, roads & public transport and health.

1.5. The initial tranche of sites (the preferred options for settlement in the “Service Village”, “Other Village” and “Small Rural Communities” categories of the Joint Core Strategy’s settlement hierarchy for the rural area) were considered by the March 2012 Cabinet meeting.

1.6. The April 2012 Cabinet meeting considered the preferred options for the rural area Main Towns and Key Service Centres of Diss, Harleston, Loddon/Chedgrave and Hingham

1.7. This report seeks Cabinet’s agreement to the preferred options for settlements in the Norwich Policy Area, which will form part the next consultation stage of the Council’s site specific policies and allocations development plan document (DPD). This DPD identifies sites and areas that the council considers to be the best options for meeting the objectives of the Joint Core Strategy.

1.8. This document will sit alongside the Joint Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD and the Wymondham and Long Stratton Area Action Plans, which together will form the South Norfolk Local Plan. The Local Plan documents will be the starting point for determining future planning applications.

2. **Current Position and Issues**

2.1. The sites in the Norwich Policy Area (covering the settlements in South Norfolk that are closer to Norwich) have been assessed using the common assessment framework that has been used to assess sites elsewhere in the district. The assessment work has led to the recommended sites that are considered to be the best option of the sites proposed, and represent those sites that perform best when judged against the assessment framework. These assessments are based on evidence that has been collected through the two stages of consultation already undertaken, as well as from direct contact with providers of essential services and a variety of information already held by the Council.
2.2. At the end of March 2012 the Coalition Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Council must ensure its planning proposals are consistent with the NPPF. To ensure the Council meets this requirement, officers have evaluated the conformity of the site assessment framework to the NPPF. This work is contained in Appendix 1 of this report, and concludes that the site assessment criteria conform to the NPPF. The preferred options in the rural area agreed before the publication of the NPPF have been reviewed and have been found to be in conformity with national policy.

2.3. The Site Specific Policies and Allocations document proposes the preferred sites that will meet the growth targets set out in the Joint Core Strategy. In the Norwich Policy Area this includes identifying preferred options to accommodate the 1,800 homes that have not been attributed to a location (often referred to as the “floating” 1,800) but which can allow smaller settlements to grow in a way that increases the social sustainability of these settlements without unbalancing them. This tranche of proposals include sites that meet the “floating” requirement.

3. Proposal and Reasons

3.1. This report proposes preferred options for the following settlements (listed in the Joint Core Strategy settlement hierarchy category order):

**OTHER VILLAGES:** Bawburgh, Colton, Flordon, Keswick, Ketteringham, Marlborough, Swainsthorpe

**SERVICE VILLAGES:** Bramerton, Little Melton, Mulbarton & Bracon Ash, Newton Flotman, Spooner Row, Stoke Holy Cross, Surlingham, Swardeston, Tasburgh

**NORWICH FRINGE:** Colney, Trowse

**KEY SERVICE CENTRES:** Poringland/Framingham Earl

**GROWTH LOCATIONS:** Costessey/Easton and Hethersett

**STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT LOCATIONS:** Hethel, Colney (NRP)

3.2. The level of growth in each settlement is consistent with the targets and policies set out in the adopted Joint Core Strategy.

3.3. The table in appendix 2 sets out how the “floating” 1,800 is met.

3.4. Appendix 3 contains the proposed text along with the maps showing the preferred options for the settlements in the Norwich Policy Area and for the rest of the District. The proposed wording of the consultation document is contained in Appendix 4. The site assessment and sustainability appraisal information is available for inspection in the Council Offices, and will be available electronically to Cabinet at the meeting. This information will be consolidated into a draft Sustainability Report, which will be brought to the Cabinet meeting in July.

4. Other Options

4.1. In the previous two tranches of sites (as referred to in paragraphs 1.3 and 1.4) other reasonable alternatives have been explained in the proposed text of the consultation document. However, in the Norwich Policy Area settlements, all reasonable options have been proposed as preferred options.

4.2. The options that have not performed well against the assessment criteria and are recommended to be rejected, are in the appendices to this report.
4.3. The Council could decide not to progress the DPD to adoption; this would lead to future development being unplanned and uncoordinated and would lessen the Council’s ability to meet its objectives and would deny residents the opportunity to be involved in shaping their communities.

5. Relevant Corporate Priorities

5.1. Enhancing our quality of life and the environment we live in. One of the guiding principles of the Council’s planning policy, as contained in the Joint Core Strategy, is to accommodate future development needs in a way that protects and retains the distinctive character of settlements in South Norfolk. This has been an important consideration in assessing the sites and is reflected in the objectives of this local plan document.

5.2. Promoting a thriving local economy. Providing suitable and available land for economic development is one of the future needs identified in the JCS and contained in the objectives for this DPD.

5.3. Supporting communities to realise their potential. The DPD process allows for residents to participate and influence the content of the DPD.

6. Implications and Risks

6.1. Financial – the work associated with the production of the council’s planning policy documents is included within the current budget.

6.2. Legal – there is a legal requirement for local planning authorities to prepare a Local Plan for their area. This Site Specific Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document will form an important part of the Local Plan and must be prepared in accordance with development plan regulations. Once published, the preferred options will be a material consideration in determining planning applications but will carry very limited weight. The judgment on the legal challenge to the Joint Core Strategy does not impact on this work, and the Council has an adopted Joint Core Strategy that for South Norfolk carries the full weight of a statutory planning policy document.

6.3. Environmental – this local plan document has used a sustainability appraisal to ensure the impact on the environment is taken into account.

6.4. Crime Reduction – the DPD will take account of the Council’s duty under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act

6.5. Risks – Not having an adopted DPD will leave the Council vulnerable to speculative and predatory planning applications for development. It will also severely limit the Council’s ability to coordinate development to ensure the necessary infrastructure is provided.

7. Conclusion

7.1. All the sites submitted to the Council for consideration as allocations for development have been assessed using a common assessment framework. This assessment framework is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.
7.2. Having assessed the sites that have been submitted for consideration as allocations and development boundary changes, the preferred options for:

**OTHER VILLAGES:** Bawburgh, Colton, Flordon, Keswick, Ketteringham, Marlingford, Swainsthorpe

**SERVICE VILLAGES:** Bramerton, Little Melton, Mulbarton & Bracon Ash, Newton Flotman, Spooner Row, Stoke Holy Cross, Surlingham, Swardeston, Tasburgh

**NORWICH FRINGE:** Colney, Trowse

**KEY SERVICE CENTRES:** Poringland/Framingham Earl

**GROWTH LOCATIONS:** Costessey/Easton and Hethersett

**STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT LOCATIONS:** Hethel, Colney (NRP)

7.3. Together with the reasons for their selection, are contained in the appendices to this report.

8. **Recommendations**

8.1. It is recommended Cabinet agree the sites shown as preferred options in the appendices to this report as the Council’s preferred options for:

**OTHER VILLAGES:** Bawburgh, Colton, Flordon, Keswick, Ketteringham, Marlingford, Swainsthorpe

**SERVICE VILLAGES:** Bramerton, Little Melton, Mulbarton & Bracon Ash, Newton Flotman, Spooner Row, Stoke Holy Cross, Surlingham, Swardeston, Tasburgh

**NORWICH FRINGE:** Colney, Trowse

**KEY SERVICE CENTRES:** Poringland/Framingham Earl

**GROWTH LOCATIONS:** Costessey/Easton and Hethersett

**STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT LOCATIONS:** Hethel, Colney (NRP)

8.2. These sites will be included in the preferred options consultation document, which will be published in September 2012.

8.3. It is also recommended that Cabinet delegate to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council (as planning policy falls within his portfolio) the ability to agree to corrections and minor text changes to the consultation document, providing they are not material to the preferred sites agreed.
Site Specifics Allocation Sites Checklist – Conformity with NPPF

**Introduction**

This paper reviews the site assessment framework and its conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to consider whether there are any elements of the NPPF which could raise questions over the relative weighting given to selection criteria.

The purpose of the document is to verify that the decisions made and weighting applied during the site selection process remain valid, given the requirements of paragraphs 212 and 216 of the NPPF.

In the first section we consider the main issues raised by the publication of the NPPF, before assessing the compliance of each selection criteria against the NPPF in the second section.

**Section 1 - Issues raised by the NPPF**

Paragraph 31 of the NPPF requires co-operation to develop a strategy for provision of infrastructure. Retention of infrastructure is not specifically stated, but is assumed to also apply, as per the criterion for protected rail routes.

Although not strongly worded, NPPF paragraph 32 implies a priority for sustainable transport modes, however it states “development should only be prevented on transport grounds where residual cumulative impacts of development are severe”. The main issue this raises for the selection criteria is the extent to which access to transport can still be used to rule out sites in remote locations as under the selection criteria used, a site can score red on local access to services or lack of access to public transport.

NPPF paragraph 34 emphasises the importance of maximising sustainable transport modes if ‘significant movement’ is to be generated, but states “However this needs to take account of policies set out elsewhere in the Framework, particularly in rural areas”. This supports development in rural locations and again needs to be considered in relation to whether the site selection criteria of local access to public transport and local services are affected.

Paragraph 55 states that in rural areas, housing should be located where it will maintain vitality of rural communities and avoid isolated new homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances. Consideration needs to be given to the extent that this affects the weight given to development boundaries.

Paragraph 137 states that local planning authorities should look for opportunities for development within conservation areas or setting of heritage assets to enhance their significance. Consideration needs to be given to whether the site selection process is overly negative in relation to development affecting listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and conservation areas. Sites must not have been excluded solely on their impact on heritage assets where development could improve their setting.

Paragraphs 17, 109, 110, 111, 113, 156, 157 all emphasise conservation / enhancement of the natural environment (including landscape, paragraph 156) and
allocation of land of lesser environmental value. Paragraphs 154 and 157 state that plans should identify land where development would be inappropriate. It is unclear whether ‘environmental value’ refers to ecological designations or a broader definition of locally-valued landscape, or whether this applies to ‘amenity’ designations. Site criteria include local designations of open land, river valleys, southern bypass landscape protection zone and important spaces.

Section 2 - Assessment of conformity of site criteria

A traffic-light system was applied to the assessment criteria during the sites assessment process, with a positive assessment classified green, or if mitigation might be required, classified as amber. Some criteria were given extra weight by enabling them to feature as ‘red’ if significant mitigation was required or more serious issues emerged. Criteria afforded this additional weighting in the sift process are identified in the text below.

The criteria have been listed in the order they appear on the checklist; the relevant paragraphs in NPPF are bulleted below.

Size of site/density: allocations are made for 5+ dwellings. Size of site dictates size of allocation, with densities proposed which reflect the immediate context in most cases.
- Para 55 states that new isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided.
- Para 61 emphasises need for integration of new development with existing built environment.
- Para 157 states plans should provide detail on form, scale, access & quantum where appropriate.

It is not therefore considered that there is any conflict between this criteria and the NPPF.

JCS settlement hierarchy: allocations are made in conformity with targets laid out in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which are in turn based on accessibility of services at each settlement.
- Para 7 states importance of accessibility of local services;
- Para 17 directs plans to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable;
- Para 30 supports pattern of development which facilitates use of sustainable transport; paras 34 & 35 minimise need to travel, maximise use of sustainable transport;
- Para 47 set out own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances
- Para 55 maintain vitality of rural communities.
- Para 34 also states “developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. However this needs to take account of policies set out elsewhere in the Framework, particularly in rural areas”.

The principle of a settlement hierarchy to deliver sustainable growth is not considered to conflict with the NPPF.
Site Specifics Allocation Sites Checklist – Conformity with NPPF

**Brownfield**: previously developed land is preferred, assuming other aspects of the site are appropriate.
- Para 17 states encourage effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (provided that it is not of high environmental value).
- Para 111 reuse brownfield land provided it is not of high environmental value, and consider setting local target for brownfield use.
- (Para 89 also emphasises use of brownfield land, but relates to greenbelt).

There is not considered to be any conflict between this criteria and the NPPF.

**Settlement boundary**: sites within or adjacent to settlement boundaries are preferred; additional weighting is applied, with sites over 400m from the settlement boundary scoring red.
- Para 55 in rural areas, housing should be located where it will maintain vitality of rural communities and avoid isolated new homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances.

It is considered that although the NPPF does reduce the importance of economic development being specifically located within existing settlements (although still requiring it be sustainable), the above paragraph gives a clear steer that development should remain within defined settlements and not in the form of sporadic development across the countryside. It is therefore considered there is no conflict in preferring sites for residential development that are within or adjacent to development boundaries.

**Listed buildings**: sites affecting the setting of a listed building require mitigation policies; additional weighting applied, with sites containing a listed building scoring red.
- Para 7 protecting our historic environment;
- Para 14 footnote provides exception to presumption in favour of sustainable development for designated heritage assets;
- Para 17 conserve heritage assets appropriate to their significance;
- (para 65 provides exceptional reason to refuse planning permission for LB);
- Paras 126, 129, 130 enhance significance of heritage assets; contribution made by historic environment to character of place.
- Paras 132 & 134 great weight given to conservation of heritage assets
- Para 137 states that opportunities for development within setting of heritage asset that enhance their significance should be sought.
- Para 156 strategic priorities of plan-making include conservation of historic environment

In assessing this criteria, development which impacted on listed buildings would score red. However, this was largely used as an eliminating factor where development would harm, or potentially harm, the setting of a building. In some cases, the potential to enhance the setting was a consideration in selecting the site. It is not known of any cases where a site was ruled out solely on the impact on a listed building without any consideration of whether development would enhance or detract from its setting. Therefore no significant conflict with the NPPF is envisaged.
Scheduled Ancient Monument: sites affecting the setting of a SAM require mitigation policies; additional weighting applied, with sites containing a SAM scoring red.

- Para 7 protecting our historic environment;
- Para 14 footnote provides exception to presumption in favour of sustainable development for designated heritage assets;
- Para 17 conserve heritage assets appropriate to their significance;
- (para 65 provides exceptional reason to refuse planning permission for SAM);
- Paras 126, 129, 130 enhance significance of heritage assets; contribution made by historic environment to character of place.
- Paras 132 & 134 great weight given to conservation of heritage assets
- Para 137 states that plans should look for opportunities for development within the setting of heritage assets to enhance their significance.
- Para 156 strategic priorities of plan-making include conservation of historic environment

In assessing this criteria, development which was within a scheduled Para 7 protecting our historic environment ancient monument would score red. However, this was used as an eliminating factor where development would harm, or potentially harm, the monument. Therefore no significant conflict with the NPPF is envisaged

Conservation Area: sites in conservation areas would be very carefully considered, and if allocated would be likely to have mitigation policies attached.

- Para 7 protecting our historic environment;
- Para 14 footnote provides exception to presumption in favour of sustainable development for designated heritage assets;
- (para 65 provides exceptional reason to refuse planning permission for conservation area);
- Paras 126, 129, 130 enhance significance of heritage assets; contribution made by historic environment to character of place.
- Paras 132 & 134 great weight given to conservation of heritage assets
- Para 137 states that opportunities should be sought for development within conservation areas to enhance significance.
- Para 138 recognises that not all elements of conservation area contribute to significance.
- Para 156 strategic priorities of plan-making include conservation of historic environment
- Para 157 identify land where development inappropriate

Whilst sites within or affecting conservation areas were scored amber, this did not in itself rule them out unless it was considered that development would cause harm or had the potential to cause harm in comparison with another site under consideration. In some cases sites in or adjacent to conservation areas were brought forward. It is not therefore considered that there is any conflict with the NPPF.

Historic park/garden: sites in historic parkland would be very carefully considered, and if allocated would be likely to have mitigation policies attached.

- Para 7 protecting our historic environment;
Site Specifics Allocation Sites Checklist – Conformity with NPPF

- Para 14 footnote provides exception to presumption in favour of sustainable development for designated heritage assets;
- Para 17 conserve heritage assets appropriate to their significance;
- (para 65 provides exceptional reason to refuse planning permission for designated heritage asset);
- Paras 126, 129, 130 enhance significance of heritage assets; contribution made by historic environment to character of place.
- Paras 132 & 134 great weight given to conservation of heritage assets
- Para 137 notes that opportunities for development should be sought within the setting of heritage assets to enhance significance.
- Para 156 strategic priorities of plan-making include conservation of historic environment

Whilst sites within or affecting historic parkland were scored amber, this did not in itself rule them out unless it was considered that development would cause harm or had the potential to cause harm in comparison with another site under consideration. In some cases sites in or adjacent to conservation areas were brought forward. It is not therefore considered that there is any conflict with the NPPF.

Tree Preservation Order: presence of a protected tree on site or immediately adjacent and likely to be affected by development would be noted.
- Para 7 protecting our natural environment, improve bio-diversity;
- Para 14 conserve natural environment, seek high quality amenity
- (Para 118 protection for habitats including aged or veteran trees)
- Para 156 strategic priorities of plan-making include conservation of environment including landscape

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Ancient Woodland: sites adjacent to ancient woodland, affecting their setting would require mitigation; additional weighting applied, with sites containing ancient woodland scoring red.
- Para 7 protecting our historic and natural environment, improve bio-diversity;
- Para 14 conserve natural environment, seek high quality amenity
- Para 17 conserve heritage assets appropriate to their significance;
- Para 110 allocate land with least environmental/amenity value;
- (Para 118 protection for habitats including aged or veteran trees)
- Para 156 strategic priorities of plan-making include conservation of environment including landscape

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Site of archaeological interest (Historic Environment Record exists): any sites containing Historic Environment Record (HER) are noted, as investigative work may need to be done by developer, affecting viability.
- Para 7 protecting our historic and natural environment;
Paras 126 & 129 enhance significance of heritage assets; contribution made by historic environment to character of place.

(Para 28 requires HER to be consulted for application)

Para 47 footnotes to define ‘deliverable’ and ‘developable’ refer to viability.

Para 139 un-designated archaeological assets of equal significance to scheduled monuments to be given equal protection.

Para 169 should use evidence about historic environment to predict where unidentified archaeological heritage assets may be discovered, and have access to HER.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

**Protected hedgerow:** any sites containing protected hedges are noted, as there is a strong presumption that a protected hedgerow cannot be removed, affecting viability.

- Para 7 protecting our historic and natural environment, improve bio-diversity;
- Para 17 conserve & enhance natural environment;
- Para 47 footnotes to define ‘deliverable’ and ‘developable’ refer to viability.
- Para 110 allocate land with least environmental value;
- Para 113 set criteria based policies for development affecting protected wildlife or landscape areas (distinctions between hierarchy of designated/protected sites);
- Para 126 conserve heritage assets (weight of conservation depends on importance);
- Para 156 strategic priority to conserve and enhance natural and historic environment, including landscape.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

**Agricultural land grades 1 & 2:** sites which are currently in use for agriculture will be considered, but those in agricultural land grades 1 & 2 will be least preferred.

- Para 7 protecting our natural environment, use natural resources prudently;
- Para 17 conserve natural environment, allocate land of lesser environmental value;
- Para 110 allocate land of lesser environmental value;
- Para 112 states that “where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of higher quality”.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

**SSSI:** sites immediately adjacent to SSSI would require some mitigation; additional weighting applied, with sites containing a SSSI scoring red as development would need to be of regional or national significance.

- Para 7 protect our natural environment;
- Para 9 move from net loss to net gains for nature;
Para 17 conserve natural environment, allocate land of lesser environmental value;
Para 110 allocate land with least environmental value;
Para 113 set criteria based policies for development affecting protected wildlife or landscape areas (distinctions between hierarchy of designated/protected sites);
Para 156, 157 strategic priority to conserve and enhance natural and historic environment, including landscape; identify where development would be inappropriate.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

CWS: sites immediately adjacent to, or slightly overlapping CWS would require some mitigation; additional weighting applied, with sites containing a significant part of a CWS scoring red.

Para 7 protect our natural environment;
Para 9 move from net loss to net gains for nature;
Para 17 conserve natural environment, allocate land of lesser environmental value;
Para 110 allocate land with least environmental value;
Para 113 set criteria based policies for development affecting protected wildlife or landscape areas (distinctions between hierarchy of designated/protected sites);
Para 156, 157 strategic priority to conserve and enhance natural and historic environment, including landscape; identify where development would be inappropriate.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Area of open land (ENV2): pending the formulation and adoption of Development Management policies and Landscape Assessment Review, sites within previously designated zones are identified.

Paras 17, 109, 110, 111, 113, 156, 157 refer to different roles for protecting the countryside, conserving the natural environment, allocating land of lesser environmental or amenity value and seeking a good standard of amenity.

Para 154 and 157 identify land where development would not be appropriate and para 156 specifically mentions landscape.

Whilst the existing SNLP policy may not be fully compliant with the NPPF, it is considered that there is sufficient reference within the NPPF to justify strategic gaps and therefore this criteria remains valid.

River valley (ENV3): pending the formulation and adoption of Development Management policies and Landscape Assessment Review, sites within previously designated zones are identified.
Paras 17, 109, 110, 111, 113, 156, 157 refer to different roles for protecting the countryside, conserving the natural environment, allocating land of lesser environmental or amenity value and seeking a good standard of amenity.

Para 154 and 157 identify land where development would not be appropriate and para 156 specifically mentions landscape.

It is not considered that there is any conflict in seeking to preserve valued landscapes and therefore this criteria is consistent with the NPPF.

Southern bypass landscape protection zone (ENV6): pending the formulation and adoption of Development Management policies and Landscape Assessment Review, sites within previously designated zones are identified.

Paras 17, 109, 110, 111, 113, 156, 157 refer to different roles for protecting the countryside, conserving the natural environment, allocating land of lesser environmental or amenity value and seeking a good standard of amenity.

Para 154 and 157 identify land where development would not be appropriate and para 156 specifically mentions landscape.

Whilst the existing SNLP policy may not be fully compliant with the NPPF, it is considered that there is sufficient reference in the NPPF to justify protecting countryside for strategic purposes and therefore this criteria remains valid.

SAC: sites overlapping SAC have additional weighting applied, scoring red, as development would need to be of national or international significance.

Para 7 protect our natural environment;
Para 9 move from net loss to net gains for nature;
Para 17 conserve natural environment, allocate land of lesser environmental value;
Para 110 allocate land with least environmental value;
Para 113 set criteria based policies for development affecting protected wildlife or landscape areas (distinctions between hierarchy of designated/protected sites);
Para 156, 157 strategic priority to conserve and enhance natural environment; identify where development would be inappropriate.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Protected rail route: if a site is crossed by a protected route, site layout would be affected, impacting on viability.

Para 31 strategy for provision of infrastructure. Retention of infrastructure not specifically stated, but assumed to be included.
Para 47 footnotes to define ‘deliverable’ and ‘developable’ refer to viability.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Gas pipeline: if a site is crossed by a pipeline, site layout would be affected, impacting on viability.
Site Specifics Allocation Sites Checklist – Conformity with NPPF

- Para 47 footnotes to define ‘deliverable’ and ‘developable’ refer to viability.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Oil pipeline: if a site is crossed by a pipeline, site layout would be affected, impacting on viability.
- Para 47 footnotes to define ‘deliverable’ and ‘developable’ refer to viability.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Article 4 direction: where a site is subject to an Article 4 direction, it scores amber on the site selection criteria.
- Para 17 conserve heritage assets appropriate to their significance
- Paras 17, 109, 110, 111, 113, 156, 157 refer to different roles for protecting the countryside, conserving the natural environment, allocating land of lesser environmental or amenity value and seeking a good standard of amenity.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Sites on a mineral resource: the adopted Minerals & Waste Core Strategy policy 16 requires developers to investigate the viability of extracting underlying mineral resources prior to development on sites over 1ha. While this could result in improved sustainability and profits for a site, it could also affect viability. Sites on mineral resources are therefore identified.
- Para 47 footnotes to define ‘deliverable’ and ‘developable’ refer to viability;
- Para 143 prevent sterilising known mineral resources, encourage prior extraction of minerals.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Mineral/waste safeguarding zone: sites falling within Minerals & Waste Consultation Areas are subject to safeguarding provisions, and there would be M&W objections to development on these sites. These sites are identified.
- Para 120 to prevent pollution, new development to be appropriate for its location;
- Para 143 define safeguarding areas to prevent sterilising known mineral resources, encourage prior extraction of minerals.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Sewage treatment works safeguarding zone: sites falling within the Consultation Areas of sewage treatment works are subject to safeguarding provisions, and there would be M&W and water authority objections to development on these sites. These sites are identified.
Site Specifics Allocation Sites Checklist – Conformity with NPPF

- Para 120 to prevent pollution, new development to be appropriate for its location;

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

**Protection of important spaces (IMP3):** pending the formulation and adoption of Development Management policies, sites within previously designated zones are identified.

- Para 17 secure good standard of amenity;
- Para 110 allocate land with least amenity value;
- Para 157 identify where development would be inappropriate.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

**Primary shopping area:** pending the formulation and adoption of Development Management policies, sites proposed for non-commercial uses within previously designated commercial zones are identified.

- Para 17 take account of different roles and characters of areas;

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

**Central business area:** pending the formulation and adoption of Development Management policies, sites proposed for non-commercial uses within previously designated commercial zones are identified.

- Para 17 take account of different roles and characters of areas;

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

**Flood risk:** sites in Flood Zone 1 are preferred over sites with higher levels of flood risk, which are identified and additional weighting applied, with sites containing FZ3 scoring red. Environment Agency flood map, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and local flood issues from Integrated Urban Drainage studies refer.

- Paras 17, 94, 97 take full account of flood risk;
- Paras 100, 101, 102 direct development away from highest risk (SFRA, local flood authorities) using sequential test/exception test where necessary;
- Para 156 need strategic policy on flood risk
- (Technical Guidance on Flood, Minerals & Waste paras 2-5 repeat NPPF paras 100-102)

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

**Hazardous zone:** sites within hazardous zone consultation areas are identified, as mitigation would be needed if development was deemed suitable at that location.

- Para 109 prevent new & existing development being put at unacceptable risk;
Site Specifics Allocation Sites Checklist – Conformity with NPPF

- Para 120 prevent unacceptable risks from pollution; if site is contaminated, developer/landowner responsible for securing safe development.
- Para 121 site must be suitable for its new use

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Site contamination/pollution: sites which are known to be or potentially are contaminated due to previous uses are identified.
- Para 109 prevent new & existing development being put at unacceptable risk;
- Para 120 prevent unacceptable risks from pollution; if site is contaminated, developer/landowner responsible for securing safe development.
- Para 121 site must be suitable for its new use

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Highway improvement: sites will be assessed by this criterion at shortlist stage, and landowners/developers will be asked to confirm sites are viable to be taken forward after appropriate highways improvements are taken into account.
- Para 31 co-operate to develop strategies for provision of infrastructure;
- Para 32 implied priority for sustainable transport modes and “development should only be prevented on transport grounds where residual cumulative impacts of development are severe”;
- Para 35 developments located to maximise transport efficiency/minimise traffic

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Access/safety issues: sites will be assessed by this criterion at shortlist stage, and landowners/developers will be asked to confirm sites are viable to be taken forward after access/safety improvements are taken into account.
- Para 7 accessible local services
- Para 32 implied safe and suitable access for all
- Para 35 safe & secure layouts, minimise conflicts between traffic/cyclists/pedestrians;
- Para 75 policies protect/enhance public rights of way/access.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Local access to services: sites preferred which are closest to ‘core services’ (school, primary health care, retail provision, local employment opportunity, public transport journey to work) and additional weighting applied, with sites more than 800m from any core service scoring red.
- Para 7 accessible local services;
- Para 17 fullest possible use of public transport, walking, cycling;
- Para 30 support pattern of development which facilitates use of sustainable transport;
Para 32 implied priority for sustainable transport modes and “development should only be prevented on transport grounds where residual cumulative impacts of development are severe”.

Para 34 developments that generate significant movement are located where need to travel minimised and use of sustainable transport modes maximised but must take account of other NPPF policies, particularly in the rural areas.

Para 35 prioritise pedestrians/cyclists

Whilst there may have been more recognition in the NPPF of reliance on the private car in the rural area, its emphasis on sustainable development still provides justification for a strong preference for sites close to services.

Public transport access issues: this criterion has additional weighting applied, with sites more than 800m from a travel-to-work bus route scoring red.

- Para 17 fullest possible use of public transport, walking, cycling;
- Para 30 support pattern of development which facilitates use of sustainable transport;
- Para 32 implied priority for sustainable transport modes and “development should only be prevented on transport grounds where residual cumulative impacts of development are severe”.
- Para 34 developments that generate significant movement are located where need to travel minimised and use of sustainable transport modes maximised. “However, must take account of other NPPF policies, particularly in the rural areas”.
- Para 35 have access to high quality public transport facilities.

Whilst there may have been more recognition in the NPPF of reliance on the private car in the rural area, its emphasis on sustainable development still provides justification for a strong preference for sites with access to public transport.

Land value: this criterion will be addressed at shortlist stage by informing developers/landowners of the policy requirements for development of their sites, including any mitigation requirements specific to the site that we are currently aware of. Landowners/developers will be asked to demonstrate the viability of their sites taking into account these policy requirements, or to prove why sites are not viable. Any landowners of sites deemed as ‘reasonable alternatives’ have the opportunity to prove viability of their sites if the viability of preferred sites is questioned.

- Para 47 footnote includes viability in the definitions of ‘deliverable’ and ‘developable’ sites;
- Para 173 sites should not be burdened [by policy] such that their viability is threatened. Costs to be applied should provide “competitive returns” to a landowner and developer.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

Existing use: preferred sites will be vacant, with sites currently in use highlighted, and additional weighting applied, with sites where current use is likely or possible to continue scoring red.
Site Specifics Allocation Sites Checklist – Conformity with NPPF

- Para 47 footnote includes current availability in the definition of ‘deliverable’ sites.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

**Site availability:** sites in multiple ownership or with minor issues which can be resolved are identified (where this is known) and additional weighting applied, with sites in multiple ownership with unwilling partners, or in single ownership but not actively promoted scoring red.
- Para 47 footnote includes current availability in the definition of ‘deliverable’ sites and ‘developable’ sites.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

**Existing land use allocation:** pending the formulation and adoption of Development Management policies, sites where the current proposal conflicts to some extent with previous designations in the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan are identified. This ensures any changes to land use allocation are recognised as deliberate departures from previous policy and reflects the evolution of successive local plans. Identifying that such a conflict exists for a site would not preclude its allocation for a different use/s.

**Service availability (utilities):** sites with known service capacity constraints (e.g. sewer capacity issues) are identified.
- Para 162 take account of the need for strategic infrastructure. Assess the quality/capacity of water/utilities.

There is not considered to be any conflict between the NPPF and this selection criteria.

**Conclusion**

Whilst the first section identifies a number of areas in the NPPF which may affect some site selection criteria, the above assessment of each criteria in turn demonstrates that there is no serious cause for concern regarding their compliance with the NPPF.

In particular, in regard to the location of development, the fundamental preference for the location of development within or close to existing settlements and maximising access to services remains consistent with the aims of the NPPF.

It is therefore not considered that there is any serious conflict between the NPPF and the site assessment framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations of &quot;Floating&quot; 1,800</th>
<th>Proposed Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SETTLEMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Villages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawburgh</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colton</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flordon</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keswick</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketteringham</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlingford</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swainsthorpe</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE VILLAGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramerton</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Melton</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulbarton &amp; Bracon Ash</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton Flotman</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spooner Row</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surlingham</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swardeston</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasburgh</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORWICH FRINGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trowse</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colney</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEY SERVICE CENTRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poringland/Framingham Earl</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROWTH LOCATIONS (additional)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costessey/Easton</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hethersett</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted since base date</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 1

Major growth locations

Policy 9 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Easton/Costessey, Hethersett, Cringleford, Long Stratton and Wymondham as major growth locations within the Norwich Policy Area to deliver housing growth. Wymondham and Long Stratton are not covered within this document as they will have an Action Plan for their areas. Cringleford is not covered within this document as the Parish Council are preparing a Neighbourhood Plan for their area.

Major growth locations (Norwich Policy Area)
Costessey/Easton, Hethersett and Hethel Strategic Employment location.

Major housing growth locations:
Easton/Costessey: 1,000 dwellings
Hethersett: 1,000 dwellings

NB. All housing numbers shown above are a minimum number of dwellings to be delivered in each location. Additional land may be allocated to help deliver some of the undistributed 1800 houses still to be located within the NPA.

Strategic Employment locations
Hethel: expansion of Hethel Technology Park
Norwich Research Park (NRP): see Section 2 Norwich fringe Parishes (Colney)
Longwater Costessey: see Costessey

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.
South Norfolk Local Development Plan
Site Specific Allocations and Policies: Preferred Options consultation document
EASTON (Norwich Policy Area Service Village & Growth Location)

Easton has experienced moderate growth over recent years, with 210 dwellings completed in the 15 years to 31 March 2011, and only 2 units with permission still to be built. Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Policy 10 sets a target of at least another 1,000 homes for the Costessey/Easton area between 1 April 2008 and 31 March 2026. The Costessey/Easton area is also a prime location to accommodate part of the 1,800 units in the Norwich Policy Area that are currently not attributed to a particular settlement.

Employment immediately within the village is relatively limited, with Diocesan House at the western end, plus small local employers such as the Chez Denis restaurant/guest house on Dereham Road. To the south of the village is Easton College; the College is an important education provider for the wider sub-region and has a range of sports, recreation, conference and other facilities available for public use, making it a significant employer. To the east of the village Uniglaze 2, Cooper BMW/Mini, the Showground hotel and restaurant and the Royal Norfolk Showground also provide employment opportunities.

Form and Character
Easton originally developed as a ‘street village’ along the main Dereham Road. Estate scale development has occurred to the south, including the recent College Heights development. The village was bypassed by the creation of the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass, resulting in a number of small cul-de-sac developments filling the area between the village and the A47.

The Village sits on a plateau between the valleys of the Rivers Tud and Yare. The South Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment identifies the area around the A47 as relatively degraded due to the extensive areas of mineral extraction and significant commercial development. The relatively uniform density of housing, with many properties backing onto the surrounding countryside means that development is not well integrated with the landscape. South of the village the landscape is noticeably more rural in character, whilst to the west the Grade 1 Listed St Peter’s Church looks over a relatively open landscape. Careful consideration will need to be given to both integrating development with the surrounding landscape, particularly where it becomes more undulating and rural to the south, and looking at opportunities to enhance the areas around the A47, creating a more attractive gateway to South Norfolk and Norwich.

To the west of the village the Royal Norfolk Showground forms a significant break in development between Easton and Costessey and is covered in the Costessey section of this document.

Services and Community Facilities
The village has St Peter’s CEVC primary school, the village hall (with part time Post Office) and outdoor recreation space. Easton College also has a number of sports/recreation facilities that are available for public use.

For sites that have been assessed and rejected and therefore not considered as reasonable 2 alternatives please see the site assessment tables and sustainability appraisal for the assessment findings.
Despite an estimated population at 2010 of over 1,400 people (ONS), the village has relatively few services, partly due to the proximity of large-scale retail and leisure provision at Longwater. A number of local services and facilities were also lost following the bypassing of the village. Other key facilities are located in New Costessey, including secondary school provision at Ormiston Victory Academy, the Roundwell Medical Centre and Costessey Library.

Communication
Strategically Easton is well placed for new development. The village benefits from access to the trunk road network at the A47 Easton and Longwater junctions, although it is acknowledged that these junctions (particularly Longwater) are already under significant pressure at peak times and require improvement to accommodate further significant growth.

The village is already on bus routes that connect to Norwich city centre, the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital as well as other larger settlements including King’s Lynn, Dereham and Great Yarmouth, plus a number of dedicated routes serving Easton College. However, the village would benefit greatly from improved connections to facilities in Costessey, on foot, by cycle and by bus.

The A1074 Dereham Road is one of the main radial routes into Norwich, with plans under the JCS to create a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route; Phase 1 of which is already being implemented. Easton also benefits from one proximity to the Costessey Park and Ride site, which also includes a direct service to the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital

Development Boundary
Other than for the inclusion of the large-scale new allocation, as detailed below, there are no proposed changes to the Development Boundary. Unlike many smaller, more rural settlements, there are few opportunities to extend the Development Boundary to create additional infill opportunities, particularly as much of the housing on the edge of the village is modern, higher density estate scale or cul-de-sac development.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary and Sites for Allocation
Due to the scale of development required in the Costessey/Easton area, all of the housing sites put forward in Easton are preferred options for allocation; these have been collectively put forward by the four main landowners as Site 1152. The site size is considerably larger than would be required for 900 new homes, but reflects the need to incorporate enhanced primary school provision, a new village centre and green infrastructure/landscaping, which are reflected on the Easton Map. In particular, development of this area needs to consider how the ‘degraded’ landscape on this key route through Norfolk might be enhanced and the separate identity of Easton retained. Layout and landscaping proposals need take into account the noise

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.
implications of the neighbouring Showground. In order to incorporate strategic landscaping, reflect the varying characteristics of the existing settlement and the topography of the site, housing will be expected to be of mixed density, taking on board the requirements of the Council’s Place-Making Supplementary Planning Document (currently in draft form), with higher densities closest to facilities and public transport routes.

Site 1164 has been proposed as a location for a dedicated facility for the Easton Gymnastics Club, which has outgrown the facilities it currently uses at Easton College. The site is surrounded on three sides by the proposed housing allocations. There may be greater benefits in locating the club where it can share parking facilities as part of the new village centre; consequently Site 1164 in included within the Development Boundary for mixed use, with the caveat that its use should be considered in the context of a master plan for the village expansion under Site 1152.

Easton College has developed significantly over recent years with the creation of a range of new buildings and facilities. The College will play an important role in promoting Norwich as a ‘learning city’ (JCS Policy 7) and proposals for any further development of Easton College will be considered against relevant national and local policies; however the campus remains outside the Development Boundary.

Norfolk Food and Farming Hub
JCS Policy 5 ‘The Economy’ supports the development of a ‘flagship food and farming hub’ in the greater Norwich area, which may include the relocation of the Norwich livestock market.

The JCS does not require a formal site specific allocation, is not location specific (although notes that any proposal will need to be ‘carefully located’) and does not indicate the size of site required. The JCS also requires any proposals to be ‘carefully … controlled to ensure that it fulfils this role in a sustainable way’.

A site has been proposed by developers to the west of Easton, partly within Broadland District Council’s jurisdiction, for approximately 40ha of development. This goes beyond the immediate food and farming hub uses envisaged by JCS Policy 5 to include a range of additional commercial proposals such as a garden centre, restaurant, playbarn/crèche and other sui generis uses.

Further justification would also be needed for including other facilities such as the suggested exhibition halls/conference facilities, particularly given the proximity of the Royal Norfolk Showground and Easton College. In addition, the proposal should be judged on its impact against other employment allocations and retail centres.

The site is identified on the Easton proposals map as a possible location for a food and farming hub, for development of 5-10ha sufficient only to encompass

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.
a relocated Norwich livestock market, food and farming hub (including limited showcase retail for Norfolk producers and related food processing, packaging, storage and logistics) plus directly related ancillary uses (e.g. education facilities – including promoting public understanding of food and agriculture businesses).

Due to the size of the developers’ proposal (Site 1153), the range of uses and cross-authority location it is not possible to include the site as a preferred allocation.

South Norfolk Council is seeking views on the potential of this location and asking for proposals for any other locations that would accord with the JCS Policy 5 in relation to a potential food hub.

**Preferred Development Sites for Allocation**

<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>
| 1152 (also includes: 0066, 0417, 0544, 0618, 0647, 0755a & b, 0960a, b, c & d, part of 0035) | South and east of Easton | 51.4 | 900 homes and associated infrastructure | • Comprehensive masterplan with phasing – including any relationship to the continued expansion of Easton College  
• New village centre including village hall, village green/recreation space, post office/small scale convenience goods retail opportunity (approx. 250m² net), shared parking provision with primary school  
• Expanded primary school  
• Easton Gymnastics Club facility (see Site 1164 below)  
• Setting of St Peter’s Church, the Vicarage and Diocesan House  
• Improvements to increase capacity at A47 junctions  
• Dereham Road BRT, including improved access to facilities in Costessey  
• Pedestrian and cycle links to key locations, including Longwater employment and retail, Costessey Medical Centre, Ormiston Victory Academy, Costessey Park and

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha¹</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1164</td>
<td>Deer Park House, Bawburgh Road</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Easton Gymnastics Club facility</td>
<td>Ride site and Easton College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Landscape buffer/enhancements to the A47 corridor - layout and landscaping proposals to take into account the noise implications of the neighbouring A47 and Showground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Green infrastructure enhancements including the approach to the area between the village and Easton College and contributions to the access improvements to the Yare Valley and Bawburgh/Colney Lakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential extraction of underlying minerals resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Investigation of former gravel pit site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Foul sewage network capacity and water mains/sewers crossing site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0035</td>
<td>Royal Norfolk Showground</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Costessey section.</td>
<td>To be considered in the context of the masterplan for Site 1152.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COSTESSEY (Norwich Policy Area Fringe Parish & Growth Location)

Costessey has experienced considerable change over recent years. In the 15 years up to 31 March 2011 over 1,350 new homes were built in Costessey and 1,000 more with planning permission were still to be built. Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Policy 10 sets a target of at least another 1,000 homes for the Costessey/Easton area between 1 April 2008 and 31 March 2026. Increases in the density at the Queen’s Hills development, with an additional 80 units since 2008 and the potential for another 260, plus the redevelopment of the Roundwell Public House site, mean that Costessey has already contributed 390 units towards the JCS requirements. The parish has one of the largest populations in South Norfolk, with the 2010 ONS estimate in excess of 11,400 people.

Take-up of employment land at Longwater has also continued to be steady, with new employers and the range of uses expanded to include a pub and gym. The JCS reconfirms the status of Longwater as a ‘strategic employment location’ for the Norwich area which should be consolidated through completion/intensification of the existing SNLP allocation.

Form and Character

Costessey is situated to the west of Norwich in the valleys of the Rivers Wensum and Tud. The 2001 Landscape Character Assessment of South Norfolk indentified continued suburbanisation as a particular threat to the character of these valleys. Consequently development in the SNLP focussed on the former gravel workings at Queen’s Hills and at Lodge Farm on Dereham Road. The parish is made up of a number of distinct areas:

- **Old Costessey** is a historic settlement developed along the Street, south of a loop in the Wensum, and extending into a linear form following the line of the river along West End. The River Wensum is afforded international Special Area of Conservation status and at the western end of the village there a number of Sites of Special Scientific Interest and County Wildlife Sites within the valley.

  The village has a strong historical character, with a variety of 17th and 18th century buildings, many of which are listed. Three separate Conservation Areas are designated, highlighting some of the most attractive parts of the village. Narrow streets and a number of historic buildings which lie hard onto the edge of the road mean that the potential to accommodate traffic generated by additional development is very limited. Woodland is of ‘immense scenic quality’; the woodlands in the Tud and Wensum Valleys create an important backdrop of trees and areas of heavily wooded, low-density development help give the settlement its character (the most significant are currently protected as Important Spaces, to be covered in the Development Management Policies DPD). To the northwest Marriot’s Way provides an accessible route from Norwich, through open countryside, from which the valley landscape can be appreciated.

2 The areas described as New and Old Costessey do not correspond with the South Norfolk Council wards, but refer more broadly to the areas of 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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- **New Costessey** is predominantly a densely developed area of 20th century housing which effectively functions as a suburb of Norwich. The Tud Valley provides an important and attractive break between New and Old Costessey. The breaks in development where Townhouse Road/Norwich Road and Longwater Lane cross the Tud help maintain the separate identities of New and Old Costessey. The wooded valley sides make the Tud Valley distinctive in South Norfolk and the East Hills Wood County Wildlife Site is a prominent feature in New Costessey. To the south of the recent Lodge Farm developments the valley of the River Yare marks the transition to open countryside in the parish of Bawburgh; the Landscape Character Assessment highlights the Yare Valley as ‘an open and distinctive boundary to the city of Norwich’ which should be maintained to ‘provide a green-buffer between the city and it’s rural hinterland’ (Vol. 2 Para 14.11).

- **Longwater** is a more recently developed commercial area with a mix of retail, leisure, business and industrial uses which utilises areas of semi-derelict land and former minerals workings. The prominent position on a gateway to Norwich has proven a popular location for a number of commercial uses, including out-of-town shops, car showrooms, pubs, restaurants and a hotel. South of Longwater is the Royal Norfolk Showground, location of the annual Royal Norfolk Show and an important regional asset. The Showground is also a significant visual break in development between Costessey and neighbouring Easton.

- **Queen’s Hills** is a new community, currently under construction in a former gravel working between the Tud and Wensum Valleys. The development is screened by extensive tree belts to the north, east and west, parts of which are designated as County Wildlife Sites. A new country park will form the setting of the development to the south, integrating it with the valley landscape. The Queen’s Hills access road links the housing directly to the services and employment at Longwater, whilst a planned community centre and playing fields will be shared with Old Costessey.

**Services and Community Facilities**
The settlements have a wide range of services and community facilities, including:

- a new, purpose build medical centre;
- primary and secondary schools;
- a variety of local shops, services and employment opportunities, including a local centre along Norwich Road, plus large-scale retail and employment serving a sub-regional catchment;
- Leisure facilities, including pubs, restaurants, gym and golf club;
- a range of community buildings at the Costessey Centre and Breckland Road, providing a range of meeting and function rooms, plus recreation facilities, and permission for a new facility at Queen’s Hills;
- Library.

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.
Services and facilities are dispersed throughout the settlements; although it is noticeable that much of Old Costessey is more than 10 minutes walking distance from most of the key services and facilities used to assess sites.

Communication
Strategically Costessey is well placed for new development. The area benefits from access to the trunk road network at the A47 Longwater Junction, although it is acknowledged that this junction is already under significant pressure at peak times and requires improvement to accommodate further growth. To minimise additional pressures on the junction, Norfolk County Council (as highways authority) wish to see new allocations which ‘maximise accessibility to high quality public transport’ (NCC, Nov 2011).

The A1074 Dereham Road is one of the main radial routes into Norwich, with plans under the JCS to create a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route; Phase 1 of which is already being implemented. Costessey also benefits from one of the city’s Park and Ride sites, which includes a direct service to the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital.

Considerable traffic crosses the Wensum Valley between Costessey and the suburbs of Taverham, Drayton and Hellesdon in Broadland District; this puts pressure on a number of roads that are predominately residential in character and have required the introduction of extensive 20mph zones and associated traffic calming.

Development Boundary
Other than for the inclusion of new allocations, as detailed below, the only alternations to the Development Boundary are the removal of the areas defined as being in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 and the inclusion of some small areas of completed development. Unlike many smaller, more rural settlements, there few opportunities to extend the Development Boundary to create additional infill opportunities. Those areas that remain outside the Development Boundary are protected in order to retain the form and character of the settlement.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
The main change to the Development Boundary is the exclusion of much of the development to the north of The Street and West End, based on the results of the 2008 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The Zone 2 Flood Risk, taking into account the potential effects of climate change, impacts on the majority of the development in this area. The Development Boundary change does not result in the loss of many, if any, infill opportunities, as the development here is relatively high density and close to the street frontage; and the rear gardens to most properties were already outside the Development Boundary. Proposals in this location are likely to be alterations, extensions and redevelopments which can be assessed in against the

---

3 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for Broadland, the Broads Authority, North Norfolk, Norwich and South Norfolk (2007)
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.
relevant Development Management policies. The two dwellings immediately south of the River Tud on the east side of Longwater Lane are also excluded for the same reason.

To reflect the implementation of previous planning permissions, areas of development at Dr Torrens Way and Stimpson Loke are incorporated within the Development Boundary.

Elsewhere, the nature of the existing development at Costessey means that there are few opportunities to alter the existing Development Boundary to create small, infill plots. In particular, Queen’s Hills and the majority of New Costessey feature more modern, higher density development, where the design and layout leaves little opportunity for infilling. In Old Costessey a few small areas of development lie outside the existing Boundary, however these are largely protected to maintain the character of the periphery of the village.

A number of small, individual plots have been put forward on The Loke, to the east of Longwater Lane, however backland development here is resisted due to the un-adopted nature of the road (and lack of proposals for its improvement) and the potentially piecemeal nature of any development without a co-ordinated proposal.

**Development Boundary – specific Longwater policy**

As a strategic employment location the Council considers it important to resist the loss of existing employment uses at Longwater. Consequently it is proposed to include a policy within the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD that seeks to maintain the variety of uses already present. Principally the Longwater area was designated for B1, B2 and B8 uses⁴, however the area has developed a wider variety of employers including car showrooms and a range of commercial and leisure uses (including pub/restaurants, gym and hotel uses). There is also a significant element of retail floorspace. The policy will seek to retain sites for their existing uses in order to maintain the variety of employment that characterises the area or, where this is not viable, promote alternative B1, B2 and B8 uses. Policy wording will need to be consistent with the emerging Development Management Policies DPD which seeks to protect existing employment uses more generally.

**Preferred Development Sites for Allocation**

Given the constraints to further development north of the Dereham Road, including distance from services, highways restrictions and impact on the character of the area, the next phase of residential development for Costessey is proposed to be an extension of Lodge Farm for approximately 500 additional homes and associated infrastructure. A number of specific policy requirements are set out below.

In terms of employment growth, some additional land has already been granted planning permission (for an aggregate/building merchant) to the north

---

⁴ Use classes B1 ‘Business’, B2 ‘General industrial’ and B8 ‘Storage and distribution’ as classified in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) 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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of the existing Longwater employment area. Consequently, in addition to the remaining parts of the SNLP employment allocation at Longwater, an additional area is proposed for allocation at the north end of William Frost Way for B1, B2 and B8 uses.

At the Royal Norfolk Showground the Council is keen to maintain the balance between the site being a significant break in development, whilst also allowing for its potential as a tourism, recreation and business resource to be exploited. In recognition of permission being granted for a 150-bed hotel and extension and improvement of the existing exhibitions venue, the policy for the Showground is to be modified to allow greater scope for further enhancements to the facilities, subject to criteria including amenity, highways safety (specifically including the capacity of the A47 Easton and Longwater junctions) and visual impact. The area covered by the Showground policy has been extended to increase the flexibility for locating uses within the site; however the area south of Long Lane remains outside the Showground policy, reflecting the significantly more rural character of the landscape. Overall the site remains outside of the Development Boundaries for Costessey and Easton, in order to reflect the presumption against general building in this location.

The following table sets out the preferred sites for allocation:

<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>
| 0270a   | West of Lodge Farm | 29.5 | Approx. 500 homes and associated infrastructure | • Gateway to Norwich/Landscape setting of the City/NSBLPZ  
• Layout and landscaping proposals to take into account the noise implications of the neighbouring A47, Longwater junction and Showground.  
• Provision of Primary School site  
• Contribution to Longwater Junction improvements  
• Contribution to Dereham Road BRT  
• Safe and attractive pedestrian/cycle access to Longwater employment and retail, Bowthorpe employment area, key facilities in Costessey including the Roundwell Medical Centre and Ormiston Victory Academy  
• Noise impact from the |

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

<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>
| 0270b   | South west of Lodge Farm        | 5.6       | Green Infrastructure in association with 270a | - Landscape setting of the City  
- Phasing of provision in conjunction with above site  
- Sewer crossing site. |
| A0001a  | Longwater employment area allocation | 2.9, 4.5, 0.6 | B1/B2/B8 uses⁴             | - Restriction of uses  
- Impact on the A47 Longwater junction  
- Foul sewerage network capacity |
| A0001b  |                                  |           |                            |                                                                       |
| A0001c  |                                  |           |                            |                                                                       |
| 0782    | North of Longwater employment area | 5.8       | B1/B2/B8 uses⁴             | - Restriction of uses  
- Impact on the A47 Longwater junction  
- Protection of CWS to the north  
- Foul sewerage network capacity and sewer crossing site |
| 0035 (part) | Royal Norfolk Showground | Uses in conjunction with the existing function of the site | Revise saved South Norfolk Local Plan Policy LEI 13 to be more positive in tone and include:  
- Potential for new building/extensions to support the function of the Showground, subject to maintaining the open character of the area;  
- Impact on the A47 Longwater and Easton junctions  
- Foul sewerage network capacity |
Additional Development Sites for Consideration/Reasonable Alternatives

The following site is currently in use, but has been proposed for inclusion in the Longwater employment area. The JCS does not envisage significant expansion of Longwater and an extension is already proposed to the north to include the recently constructed aggregates/building merchant. In order to support the role of Longwater as an employment location, Site 522 could be included as an allocation for the longer-term, post-2016 or 2021, subject to capacity at the A47 Longwater junction.

<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>
| 522     | West of Longwater Employment Allocation | 7.1     | B1/B2/B8 uses⁴     | - To be phased after 2016/2021 to encourage the completion/consolidation of the existing allocated site first.  
- No development leading to a net increase in traffic until after Longwater junction improved  
- Restriction of uses  
- Landscaping to the A47 boundary  
- Foul sewerage network capacity |

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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Hethersett (Norwich Policy Area)
Policy 14 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Hethersett as a Key Service Centre in which land will be allocated for housing growth of at least 1,000 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints. Settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance. As a location for major growth, policy 10 of the JCS identifies the need in Hethersett for expansion to village services, potential relocation of the junior/high school and additional primary provision, enhanced bus services and cycle and pedestrian routes and green infrastructure providing enhanced public access to the countryside. Policy 10 also states the need for expanded capacity of the A11/A47 Thickthorn junction, on which this growth is dependant. JCS Policy 4 further identifies a need for mixed tenure housing with care in Hethersett.

Since the JCS base date April 2008 and up to September 2011, there have been no significant planning permissions granted, therefore we are seeking to allocate land for at least 1,000 dwellings.

Form and Character
Hethersett is located on the B1172 on an elevated area of land which falls away towards the north-west and south-east. Whilst attractive long distance views are obtained from the village in both these directions, particularly fine views are obtained towards the south-east where there are several mature trees and mixed plantation woodlands which add interest to the landscape. Views back towards the village from this area and the B1172 are also noteworthy, particularly across the small area of undeveloped land lying between the Norwich Road and the B1172 west of Hall Close.

The edge of the village has clearly defined boundaries on three sides; to the north-east by Shop Lane/Back Lane, to the south-east by the B1172 including attractive wooded areas and undeveloped spaces, and to the west by New Road which gives a rather harsh developed edge to the village when viewed from the west. To the north of the village the built-up area is marked by residential development which has been reinforced by recent infilling.

An area of public open space was allocated in the last Local Plan under reference A0017. Part of this has been developed for residential purposes. As the rest of the allocation has not been delivered as publicly accessible open space, it is considered that if re-allocated for that use, the site would be undeliverable. However, the space is valued by local residents, provides an important contribution towards green infrastructure, and therefore will be protected as Important Local Space under emerging Development Management Policies.

Previous Local Plans identified a Central Business Area which has helped to create a recognisable village ‘centre’. This will also be protected under

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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Emerging Development Management Policies. Hethersett has a wide range of facilities and services, including a new village hall/community centre, an infant/nursery school, junior school and high school, convenience store/supermarket, range of small independent shops/services, post office, chemist, doctor and dentist surgeries, library and a small business centre.

Communication

The B1172 offers excellent access from the village to the Thickthorn junction with the A11/A47 Norwich Southern Bypass, and onward to Norwich, Wymondham and the surrounding area generally. The Norwich Research Park, Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, Hethel Engineering Centre and Longwater Retail Park are also within easy reach.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)

The development boundary follows the line of the B1172 to the south of the settlement, Shop Lane/Back Lane and New Road. It excludes the church, Hethersett Hall, Old Hall, North Lodge/Whitehouse Farm, Long Barn and Wood Hall. These areas have been excluded due to their contribution to the setting of the village, and in some cases the character of the southern part of Hethersett.

Preferred Option - Development Boundary
It is not proposed to alter the development boundary other than to include the newly allocated sites within it.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, and would need to be masterplanned together. Due to the village’s proximity to Little Melton and Wymondham, strategic landscaping will be required to maintain separation following site allocation. The sites could accommodate approximately 1,200 additional dwellings, and approximately 12ha of enhanced community facilities and amenity open space, including a ‘green corridor’:

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>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 049     | Braymeadow Farm | 3.9      | Open space/community facilities | • Masterplanned with 950a
• May contain new school facilities
• Must contribute to green corridor |
| 084     | Land north of Gt Melton Road | 5.8      | 106 dwellings | • Masterplanned with 950a
• Contribution towards expansion of local schools
• Consideration to setting of listed building and impact on adjacent TPO woodland
• Historic Environment Record to be consulted
• Water supply and sewerage capacity issues to be addressed
• Site layout to account for water mains and sewers crossing site
• Viability of extracting underlying minerals prior to construction to be considered |
| 231     | Land adjacent to village hall | 2.2      | Open space/community facilities | • Masterplanned with 950a
• May contain new school facilities
• Viability of extracting underlying minerals prior to any construction to be considered
• Water supply, surface water and sewerage capacity issues to be addressed
• Must contribute to green corridor |
| 531     | Plant nursery, land at Grove Road | 2.2      | 23 dwellings (housing with care) | • Masterplanned with 950a
• Viability of extracting underlying minerals prior to construction to be considered
• Sewerage capacity issues to be addressed |
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.

**Hethel (Norwich Policy Area – Strategic Employment Location)**

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 9 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Hethel as a strategic employment location and states that there should be expansion of activity there, including a technology park of around 20 hectares managed to focus on advanced engineering and the growth of technology capabilities. The JCS policy states that there should be improved accessibility, particularly to Wymondham. It also states that large-scale general employment development will detract from the unique offer and will not be appropriate.

Form and Character
Hethel is located to the south east of Wymondham and approximately 10 miles south of Norwich in the parish of Bracon Ash. The village itself is predominantly rural in character and comprises isolated groups of housing and farm buildings. Hethel is one of the main employment locations in South Norfolk and has been home to the head office and factory of Lotus Cars since the 1960’s. The Lotus factory is located on the former RAF Hethel airbase, with the test track using sections of the old runway. A more recent development is the Hethel Engineering Centre, which occupies a prominent position on the road through to Wymondham. This is dedicated to supporting the growth and success of high performance engineering and manufacturing companies and individuals throughout the region. The centre offers business incubation space, specialist business support, engineering consultancy and conference/training facilities.

Services and Community Facilities
The settlement of Hethel has a very limited range of services and facilities, other than those provided by the existing businesses. There is currently no public transport serving Hethel but the JCS discusses improved accessibility to Wymondham and the JCS policy for Wymondham talks about improved cycleway links.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
There is currently no development boundary at Hethel

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
A new development boundary is proposed to include both the existing employment development at Hethel and the proposed allocation. This will require a new policy to retain existing employment uses and limit new development within the proposed development boundary (including the preferred site for allocation) to that linked with advanced engineering and technology based businesses in line with JCS policy.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as a potential allocation for a technology park. An application (reference 2012/0293) was approved for an extension to the engineering centre in March 2012. This application is on land that forms part of site 1069b.

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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**Document**

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>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1069a</td>
<td>Land at Lotus Cars Ltd (South)</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>• Use of land to be limited to advanced engineering and technology based uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land at Lotus Cars Ltd (South West)</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>• A Masterplan to be agreed for the whole site. Site to be planned in a way that would enable access to adjacent land for future development if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1069b (part)</td>
<td>Total Site Area of Preferred Allocation</td>
<td>20.40 (approx)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Suitable and safe access to be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Landscaping to be put in place to protect residential amenity of White Gables Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved accessibility and cycleway links to Wymondham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The potential for ancillary uses to be permitted to serve the allocation and surrounding employment uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• HER to be investigated prior to commencement of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Part of site 1069a is within a Hazardous Installation Consultation Zone. Level of public risk will need to be assessed by the Council in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Health and Safety Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Water main crossing site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Site 1069b within 250m of an existing waste management facility</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 were no 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.
Section 1 Questions  **Major growth locations** (Norwich Policy Area)
Costessey/Easton, Hethersett and Hethel Strategic Employment location.

**QUESTION:** Please give your views on the Preferred Option of site(s) in Costessey/Easton?

**QUESTION:** Have all the policy considerations for the Preferred Option site(s) in Costessey/Easton been identified? If not, please tell us what else is required? Please state clearly which Preferred Site your comments relate to.

**QUESTION:** Please give your views on the Preferred Development Boundary for Costessey.

**QUESTION:** Are there any other designations that should be considered in Costessey?

**QUESTION:** Please give your views on the Preferred Development Boundary for Easton?

**QUESTION:** Is this a good location for a ‘Food Hub’ or is there a better location? Please give your views

**QUESTION:** Are there any other designations that should be considered in Easton?

**QUESTION:** Please give your views on the Preferred Option of site(s) in Hethersett?

**QUESTION:** Have all the policy considerations for the Preferred Option site(s) in Hethersett been identified? If not, please tell us what else is required?

**QUESTION:** Are there any other designations that should be considered in Hethersett?

**QUESTION:** Please give your views on the Preferred Development Boundary for Hethersett?

**QUESTION:** Have all the policy considerations for the Strategic Employment Preferred Option site(s) in Hethel been identified? If not, please tell us what else is required?

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 2

Norwich Fringe Parishes
Norwich Policy Area (NPA)

Policy 12 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Norwich fringe parishes of Colney and Trowse, Costessey and Cringleford. Costessey is also, together with nearby Easton a major growth location and therefore please refer to Section 1 Major Growth Locations for preferred options for Costessey. Cringleford is not covered within this document as the Parish Council of Cringleford is preparing a Neighbourhood Plan for their area.

Policy 12 JCS seeks throughout the suburban area and fringe parishes to identify land to help deliver some of the undistributed 1800 houses still to be located within the NPA.

Colney (including Norwich Research Park)
Trowse
Colney parish includes the Norwich Research Park (NRP), the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital (NNUH) the Spire Hospital and Oakwood House BUPA care home, making it one of the strategic employment locations in the Norwich area identified in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The Joint Core Strategy seeks the allocation 55ha of specialist employment land for the first phase of a ‘next generation science park’

In terms of residential development Colney has one of the smallest populations in South Norfolk, with approximately 160 residents (ONS, 2010). As a Norwich Fringe Parish in the JCS it is a location that could be suitable for residential development; however, a large area is of the parish is devoted to employment, health and science uses and Colney sits between areas with large scale housing allocations (Cringleford – being taken forward via a Neighbourhood Development Plan; and Three Score/Bowthorpe – as part of the Norwich Site Allocations Plan).

Form and Character
Colney is situated mainly within the Yare Valley and although dispersed in nature, forms an attractive identifiable settlement. Residential development is concentrated to the north of the Old Watton Road. The Spire Hospital and BUPA care home site between the B1108 and the Old Watton Road, with the NNUH and NRP to the south of the B1108. Colney Hall and its parkland form an important and significant feature, with extensive locally listed historic parkland between the Hall and the B1108.

The landscape around the NNUH and the main NRP institutes is more open in character; with few significant hedgerows; however there are densely planted shelterbelt and the area is generally well screened from the A47.

As part of the JCS the Yare Valley is identified as a key Green Infrastructure corridor, with the aim of improving access to the valley.

Services and Community Facilities

In terms of the hamlet of Colney, facilities are limited, with a parish meeting room on Old Watton Road.

Many of the institutions, particularly the NNUH, incorporate ancillary facilities such as shops, restaurants and meeting/conference venues available to staff and visitors. The parish also includes the UEA playing fields in the Yare Valley.

Communication
Colney is defined as a Strategic employment location partly in recognition of its proximity of its location within easy reach of the local and national road network; the B1108 Watton Road connecting directly to the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass and into the city. The Bowthorpe perimeter road links...
Colney with the Bowthorpe development and to the country park proposed in the JCS at Bawburgh Lakes.

The area benefits from good bus services linking the NNUH/NRP with the UEA, city centre and nearby residential development at Cringleford.

Development Boundary
The Development Boundary encompasses the main nucleus of housing focused around the church, the existing NRP, plus the proposed extensions (including Colney Hall); and both the Norfolk and Norwich University and BUPA Hospitals. The Development Boundary is designed to avoid unnecessary encroachment into the Yare Valley and the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone (NSBLPZ).

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
One small extension is proposed to Development Boundary north of the Old Watton Road to incorporate Site 573 and the adjoining group of houses. A small area of land is also removed from the Boundary at Colney Hall, excluding an area identified as being in flood risk zones 2 and 3.

It is also proposed to have a policy covering the existing hospitals and NRP institutes within the Development Boundary, placing the same restrictions on their reuse or redevelopment that apply to the new allocations (see table below).

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The JCS refers to the development of 55ha (gross) of the first phase of a ‘next generation science park’. For the NRP it is proposed to retain the majority of the existing allocations from the SNLP. Land to the rear/west of the John Innes Centre has already been developed and is therefore removed from the allocation. Although it has permission, the land to the rear/east of the Institute of Food Research which has yet to be developed is included as an allocation, to help ensure its future delivery as part of the NRP. Between these sites 37.7ha of development is proposed. The site at Colney Hall totals 14ha, however due to the unique characteristics of the site net development will be restricted to 8ha, unless it can be demonstrated that this can be exceeded with out harming the Listed Building and its setting, the locally listed Historic Parkland, the landscape bordering the Yare Valley and other important features of the site.

Uses will be limited primarily to Use Class B1(b) i.e. research and development, studios, laboratories and high tech, plus hospital related development. Ancillary and complementary uses will also be acceptable, so long as they are supportive of and essential to the core functions of the NRP and remain ancillary. Potential uses include: recuperative and respite care; education and training facilities; conference facilities for knowledge transfer; short stay accommodation; cafes/restaurants; and supporting business infrastructure e.g. legal and banking services. General offices, manufacturing,

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.
storage, distribution and other uses not connected with research and development will not be acceptable.

Additional development will need to have a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure delivery, particularly transport improvements. These include: the B1108/A47 junction; upgrading of the B1108 Watton Road to 7.3m single carriageway standards, with improved access junctions; and enhanced public transport, pedestrian and cycle facilities to/from and within the site, including enhanced links to the main UEA campus.

Although alternative sites have been put forward, these are not as well related to the NNUH and the existing institutes at the NRP. In addition the alternative sites would encroach further into the NSBLPZ or the valley of the River Yare. In particular Site 1144 could set an undesirable precedent for intrusion into the river valley landscape development to the east of Colney Lane.

The following table sets out the preferred sites for allocation:

<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>
| A0005 (part) | Adjacent to Norwich Research Park | 33.6ha | Science Park | • Limited to B1(b), hospital expansion and ancillary/complementary uses  
• Master plan, including potential phasing in relation to other parts of the NRP allocation. Key considerations – Integration with existing uses; high quality buildings and spaces; central hub; landscape strategy.  
• Exemplar sustainable development (BREEAM very good+), landmark design quality.  
• Utilities/Infrastructure plan – including improvements to B1108, A47 junction, links to A11 BRT corridor, links to large-scale housing locations (Crispleford, Hethersett etc.)  
• Public transport improvements linked to the above to encourage significant modal shift to/from and within NRP.  
• Development density and |

---

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

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.
Policy 12 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Trowse as a fringe parish of the Norwich urban area.

Form and Character
Development in Trowse has historically been concentrated on The Street and White Horse Lane. The settlement was developed during the latter part of the nineteenth century where a model village of workers’ terraced cottages and associated social and community facilities were provided by the Colman family. The village is still dominated by these terraces. The historic core and part of the setting of the village is now a large Conservation Area. The village is set on the lower part of the eastern slope of the Yare valley. The wooded area of Crown Point forms an important backdrop to the eastern edge of the village. The southern part is situated on the slopes of the valley side and abuts open agricultural land. To the west, the land falls within the floodplain of the Yare Valley. Newer development on The Street has been sympathetic to this character. Newer estate scale development in the village has been located in unobtrusive locations (such as off Whitlingham Lane and at Devon Way) so as not to have an adverse effect on the historic character of the village core or its river valley setting. This has left the model village relatively untouched.

Two important spaces exist. Trowse Common which contributes to the setting of the terraces on White Horse Lane, and secondly the area north-west of Whitlingham Lane which lies in the Broads Authority area, separating the village from the commercial uses to the north, and the city itself.

Detached from the main village is a scatter of dwellings on Whitlingham Lane. Any consolidation of development in this area would adversely affect its very rural character. Overall the village is attractively situated.

The village is identified in the JCS as a fringe parish to Norwich and as such is a location in which land is to be identified to contribute towards the smaller sites allowance set out in Policy 9 of the JCS.

Social and Community Facilities
There is a good range of social and community facilities and the village has very good accessibility to the city.

Communications
The village previously suffered from very heavy traffic flows using the old A146. This has been removed by the construction of the A146 Trowse bypass which passes south of the village and joins the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass at a major junction south east of the village. The A47 Norwich Southern Bypass skirts the village to the south east on the upper part of the valley slope. The accessibility to the Norwich Area has been generally enhanced by these roads.

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.
White Horse Lane has remained open since the A146 Trowse bypass has been opened thereby providing a through route to the present road junction at Martineau Lane, although there is a bus gate at the western end of White Horse Lane to limit eastbound traffic through to Norwich during the morning peak hours.

Development Boundary (2011 consultation)
The development boundary has been drawn to encompass the existing development and the proposed allocations, and to limit the incursion of development into the Yare Valley and surrounding Area of High Landscape Quality.

Preferred Option - Development Boundary
It is proposed to adopt the majority of the development boundary that was subject to the previous consultation. The main alterations proposed are to incorporate the proposed allocation (see below) and to remove areas of the boundary which encompass land within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 with the exception of land to the north of The Street adjacent to the River Yare known as the May Gurney site. The May Gurney site is in Flood Risk Zone 2 but is previously developed land of which redevelopment has been demonstrated to be feasible in terms of flood risk in previously submitted planning applications and the redevelopment of which will allow for the unlocking of a large area for redevelopment within the boundaries of the City of Norwich.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The proposed allocated site for residential development to the south of the village can accommodate approximately 250 dwellings. The allocation comprises of two suggested sites, however these are adjacent and we would expect development of the two sites to be subject to a single comprehensive masterplan.

In addition to the proposed residential development site allocation, it is proposed to retain the allocation for a Park and Ride site on the opposite side of the A47 from the village which Norfolk County Council seek to provide as part of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATS).

<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>
| 151     | Land on White Horse Lane 4.76 | 130 dwellings | • Development be accessed from White Horse Lane with access provided through the development to site 1173  
• Development fronting White Horse Lane will reflect the character of adjoining development in Trowse conservation area  
• An extension to the footway |
| 1173 (part) | Land rear of Charolais Close & Devon Way | 4.5 | 120 dwellings | along White Horse Lane will be provided to ensure there is a continuous footway from the site to the village centre  
- The development will be designed with appropriate landscaping to mitigate for any visual impact from the A146 and A47  
- Anglian Water advice regarding foul sewerage capacity  
- Safeguarding provisions in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 will apply |
| A0002 | Land north of A146 & east of A47 | 3.2 | Park and Ride Site | Principle and all vehicular access will be provided to the site through site 151  
- Pedestrian and cycle links to be provided to the sports ground accessed from Hudson Avenue and the amenity space on Devon Way  
- The development will be designed with appropriate landscaping to mitigate for any visual impact from the A146 and A47  
- Anglian Water advice regarding foul sewerage capacity  
- Safeguarding provisions in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 will apply |

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

SECTION 2 Questions  **Norwich fringe parishes** (Norwich Policy Area) Colney including Norwich Research Park (NRP), Trowse

**QUESTION:** Please give your views on the Preferred Development Boundary for Colney?  
**QUESTION:** Please give your views on the Policy for the Norwich Research park?  
**QUESTION:** Are there any other designations that should be considered in Colney?  

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.
QUESTION: Please give your views on the Preferred Option site(s) for Trowse?
QUESTION: Have all the policy considerations for the Preferred Option site(s) in Trowse been identified? If not, please tell us what else is required?
QUESTION: Are there any other designations that should be considered in Trowse?
QUESTION: Please give your views on the Preferred Development Boundary for Trowse?

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 3

Main Towns

Policy 13 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Main Towns (see below) in the rural area and Wymondham in the Norwich Policy Area. Please note that Wymondham is not part of this document and will have its own Area Acton Plan. See our website www.s-norfolk.gov.uk/ldf for details. The main towns subject to servicing constraints, these towns will accommodate additional housing (numbers indicate a minimum number of dwellings) town centre uses and employment and services.

**Diss**
300 dwellings
Significant expansion on or adjacent to the town centre
Employment growth to meet the needs of town and large rural catchment

**Harleston**
200-300 dwellings limited expansion in or adjacent to the town centre
Expansion based on existing employment areas

*These settlements were agreed by Cabinet on 30th April 2012*
SECTION 4

Key Service Centres

Policy 14 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Key Service Centres where land will be allocated for residential development of the scale indicated below (and subject to detailed assessment including impact on form and character and the resolution of any specific servicing constraints). Established retail and service areas will be protected and enhanced where appropriate, and local employment opportunities will be promoted.

Hingham: approximately 100 dwellings
Loddon/Chedgrave: 100 to 200 dwellings
Poringland/Framingham Earl 100 to 200 dwellings

Part A - Norwich Policy Area (NPA) ‘Key Service Centres’
Poringland/Framingham Earl

N.B. The settlements in the Norwich Policy Area (shown above) may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver some of the undistributed 1800 houses still to be located within the NPA.

Part B - Rural Area ‘Key Service Centres’
Hingham, Loddon/Chedgrave

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.
PART A- Norwich Policy Area ‘Key Service Centres’

Poringland/Framingham Earl (Norwich Policy Area)
Policy 14 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Poringland/Framingham Earl as a Key Service Centre in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 100-200 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints. Settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

The JCS base data included an allowance for land allocated under the previous Local Plan, some of which has since been built out by Norfolk Homes. Since the JCS base date April 2008 and up to September 2011, permission has been granted for 5 dwellings at Gable Farm, Carr Lane. Therefore we are seeking to allocate land for around 200 dwellings, plus a potential contribution towards the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Policy 14 also provides for the promotion of local employment opportunities to serve this growth. While the JCS supporting evidence does not quantify a specific employment land requirement for Poringland/Framingham Earl, it is considered desirable to provide for local jobs, and land is available in close proximity to the village centre which provides for potential employment related development.

Two sites allocated under the previous Local Plan remain undelivered, and these sites have been re-assessed during the site allocation process. Land north of Heath Loke was allocated for a new primary school under reference A0022a. However, the local school has expansion plans, and this school site is no longer required. Land north of Shotesham Road and east of Carr Lane was allocated for housing under reference A0021b (the housing from this site was anticipated in the JCS base data for Poringland). The site has not yet been delivered, but an application has been lodged for development of this site (incorporating an adjacent brownfield site) for housing and office use. As this application has been submitted, the allocation will be carried forward, but this site will therefore not count towards the JCS target of additional dwellings.

Land adjacent to other housing allocation sites was also allocated under the previous Local Plan for public open space and amenity. Part of this amenity space has been provided adjacent to the community centre. The remainder of the allocation was identified and consulted on in the Site Specific Allocation public consultation in 2011, and will be carried forward. A further area of publicly accessible open space at Poringland Conservation Area and Fishing Lakes was suggested for public open space and has been through consultation. However, as this site already exists, is within the development boundary and is accessible to the public, it is more appropriate to protect it under emerging Development Management policies.

Policy 7 of the JCS states a requirement for care home provision specialising in dementia care in Poringland, and this will be provided for.

The village has a history of surface water and ground water issues, and these matters will need to be mitigated for any 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.
Form and Character
The parish of Poringland is rural in character, based on former parkland area, and is heavily wooded. The wooded area which extends into Framingham Pigot forms a unique and extensive area within the District and provides a distinctive setting for the village of Poringland. The village is comprised of parts of the parishes of Poringland, Caistor St Edmund, Stoke Holy Cross, Framingham Pigot and Framingham Earl. In particular, the parish boundary between Framingham Earl and Poringland is such that the High School and many houses on the east of Norwich Road and those on Long Road are actually in Framingham Earl parish. Development has been concentrated along the B1332 Norwich Road, with estate development to the east, mostly between Long Road and Rectory Lane. There is also some estate development at Oaklands and Oakcroft Drive, to the east of the B1332. More recently estate development has taken place to the west of Norwich Road, south of Heath Loke. Additionally, some ribbon development extends along Caistor Lane, and Stoke Road/Poringland Road. The skyline is dominated by two communication masts located off Stoke Road at the ex-MOD site.

Services and Community Facilities
Residents of the village have good access to the wide range of facilities in Poringland/Framingham Earl, including a primary and a secondary school; two GP surgeries; dentist; post office; library; two pubs; several fast food outlets; a supermarket and two convenience stores.

Communication
The developed part of the parish has direct access to Norwich via the B1332. The internal road network consists of a number of attractive, often narrow minor roads.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary is tightly drawn along Long Road to the north of Poringland village to preclude any new development north of this road, which comprises one of the most extensive wooded and parkland areas in the Norwich area. The wooded area to the rear of numbers 34 to 50 to the south of Long Road has previously been designated as an important space, to ensure the retention of the wooded character of this area. It is not proposed to alter this designation. This site and the Poringland Conservation Area and Fishing Lakes will be covered by emerging Development Management policies.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed that the development boundary is extended to encompass the newly allocated sites. Otherwise, there is no intention to alter the development boundary, as a few limited opportunities for infill development exist.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
All allocated sites in Poringland/Framingham Earl would need to prove they could overcome surface water and ground water issues. The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, and could accommodate approximately 320 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.
additional dwellings, 4.3ha of employment land, a dementia-specialist care home and 6ha of amenity open space:

<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>
| 118     | Land at The Ridings       | 1.2      | 20 dwellings       | • Layout to incorporate sewers crossing site  
                                      • Sewerage capacity issues to be mitigated  
                                      • Investigate potential of extracting minerals prior to development occurring |
| 345     | Land at Heath Farm        | 15.3     | 200 dwellings      | • Subject to suitable access  
                                      • Layout to incorporate water mains crossing site  
                                      • Waste water and sewerage capacity issues to be mitigated  
                                      • TPOs at boundary  
                                      • Formalise arrangement for open water course behind properties on Norwich Road and Caistor Lane  
                                      • Full drainage assessment required, including on-site and off-site flood risk  
                                      • Investigate potential of extracting minerals prior to development occurring  
                                      • Investigate Historic Environment Record |
| 402     | Land at Pigot Lane        | 4.4      | 100 dwellings      | • Water supply, waste water and sewerage capacity issues to be mitigated  
                                      • Layout subject to buffer zone for pumping station  
                                      • Layout to incorporate water mains crossing site  
                                      • Site at high risk of flooding from surface water drainage – mitigation required  
                                      • Investigate Historic Environment Record  
                                      • Investigate potential of extracting minerals prior to development occurring |
| A0021b  | Land north of Shotesham Road and | 7.9     | 232 dwellings (included in) | • Policy considerations are carried forward from previous Local Plan allocation and |

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.
### Site Specific Allocations and Policies: Preferred Options consultation document

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>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (ha*)</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A0022a  | Land north of Heath Loke (former school allocation) | 0.9 | Care home specialising in dementia care | - Layout to incorporate sewers crossing site  
- Sewerage capacity issues to be mitigated  
- Subject to suitable access  
- Investigate potential of extracting minerals prior to development occurring |
| 395     | Ex-MOD site, Pine Loke | 4.3 | Employment (B1) | - Use to be compatible with adjacent housing (B1)  
- Use restriction due to proximity to housing  
- Subject to appropriate access to site  
- Investigate Historic Environment Record  
- Investigate potential of extracting minerals prior to development occurring  
- Water supply and sewerage capacity issues to be mitigated  
- Full drainage assessment needed (including on-site and off-site flood risk) |
| A0022b  | Land south of Heath Loke | 6 | Amenity open space | - Public access  
- Appropriate mix of children’s play areas, sports pitches and informal recreational open space |

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

### SECTION 4 Part A Questions for Key Service Centres (Norwich Policy Area) Poringland/Framingham Earl

**QUESTION:** Please give your view on the Preferred Option site(s) for Poringland/Framingham Earl?

**QUESTION:** Have all the policy considerations for the Preferred Option site(s) in Poringland/Framingham Earl been identified? If not, please tell us what else is required? Please state clearly which preferred site your comments relate to.

**QUESTION:** Are there any other designations that should be considered in Poringland/Framingham Earl?

**QUESTION:** Please give your views on the Preferred Development Boundary for Poringland/Framingham Earl?

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.
PART B- Rural Area ‘Key Service Centres’

These settlements were agreed by Cabinet 30 April 2012

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

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 - Norwich Policy Area (NPA) ‘Service Villages’ |
| Bramerton, Little Melton, Mulbarton & Bracon Ash, Newton Flotman, Spooner Row, Stoke Holy Cross, Surlingham, Swardeston, Tasburgh |

N.B. 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.

| Part B - Rural Area ‘Service Villages’ |
| 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 Forncett End, Thurlton, Thurton (inc. part in Ashby St Mary Parish), Wicklewood, Woodton (inc. part in Bedingham Parish), 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.
South Norfolk Local Development Plan
Site Specific Allocations and Policies: Preferred Options consultation document

PART A-Norwich Policy Area ‘Service villages’

Bramerton (Norwich Policy Area)
Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Bramerton 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. Settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Since the JCS base date April 2008 and up to September 2011, permission has been granted for 6 dwellings, therefore we are seeking to allocate land for 14 dwellings.

Form and Character
Within the parish of Bramerton there are a number of groups of development; the main village running north to south along Framingham Lane and The Street; the development between, and on, Hill House Lane and Mill Lane including that which overlooks the River Yare; and small developed frontages isolated from the main village on Surlingham Lane and Cory Corner.

Within the main settlement there are a number of listed buildings; many of these, including Bramerton Hall and its wooded parkland setting, are included within the Conservation Area. Some recent infill development has taken place within the Conservation Area. Features within the village are the number of undeveloped spaces such as the junction of Framingham Lane and Bullock shed Lane which forms a small attractive open area when approaching the village from the south-west, and ponds, including the area to the south of the junction of Rockland Road and Framingham Lane which forms part of an attractive hedged garden. These undeveloped spaces reinforce the green character of the main village which includes good hedge and tree planting. The village contains a mix of dwellings, generally of single plot depth and farm buildings, many of which are located close to the roads.

Services and Community Facilities
The parish has a limited range of social and community facilities including a village hall and recreation ground.

Communication
Access to Norwich from the parish is via the C202 which links to the A146 close to its junction with the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass providing good accessibility to the wider Norwich Area.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary was drawn to resist any extensions to the village and to exclude land within the village that makes an important contribution to the Conservation Area, including the church and land around Bramerton Hall.

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 Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to retain the boundary in the form as consulted upon south of the junction of Kirby Road and The Street other than to include a mixed use allocation at Church Farm. It is also proposed to create a new boundary to the north of the junction of Kirby Road and The Street incorporating existing development along Surlingham Road as well as an allocation of 10 dwellings.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, and could accommodate approximately 20 additional dwellings. This includes the site on which the dwellings have previously been permitted referred to above.

<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>Z1220D</td>
<td>Land on Surlingham Road</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>10 dwellings</td>
<td>• Development will consist of frontage development onto Surlingham Road only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriate landscaping will be provided on the site’s northern boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1266</td>
<td>Church Farm, The Street</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>10 dwellings and B1 uses</td>
<td>• Access will be from Church Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The dwellings may also include D1 uses to allow for live-work accommodation</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.

LITTLE MELTON (Norwich Policy Area)
Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Little Melton 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. Settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Form and Character
Little Melton was historically linear in form, but some estate development has taken place at Ringwood Close, Gibbs Close and south of School Lane at Braymeadow and Greenacres. The listed building and grounds of Elm Farm, which is centrally located in the village, provides an important break in the street frontage of the centre of the village.

The village is set in open countryside, and is visible from Watton Road to the north, creating a landscape setting when approaching the village from Green Lane. However, 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.
hedges and trees to the south of the village mean there are fewer long-range vistas. The A47 is less than 220m away from the closest point of the proposed development boundary, and 129 School Lane (the dwelling closest to the A47) is only 35m from it.

Services and Community Facilities
Development along School Lane includes Little Melton Primary School and the Village Inn, plus a convenience store and MOT garage. There is a lack of footpaths in the village. This is combined with narrow roads, making pedestrian travel challenging at peak times. There are allotments, accessible from Great Melton Road and Mill Road, which contribute to the rural nature of the village. The village hall and playing field are on Mill Road, outside the development boundary and in a countryside setting.

Communication
The proximity to the A47 (via Green Lane) makes Little Melton accessible from Norwich. There are bus stops (on both sides of the road) at two points in the village, with buses to Wymondham, Hethersett and Norwich.

Development Boundary (as published during 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary covers almost all development in the parish, reflecting the cohesive built-up area. There is a small break in the development boundary where the allotments are accessed on Great Melton Road. The development boundary has prevented the further extension of the village into the surrounding open countryside, in particular the Southern Bypass Protection Zone.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
To define the development boundary as shown (as defined during 2011 public consultation) to allow for limited infill development 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 to accommodate 50 dwellings and provide multiple access/exit points for vehicles and pedestrians onto Mill Road, Ringwood Close and Gt Melton Road:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0101</td>
<td>Mill Road/Ringwood Close</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>22 dwellings</td>
<td>• Sewerage network capacity constraints must be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve pedestrian access to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619a</td>
<td>Ringwood Close</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>20 dwellings</td>
<td>• Sewerage network capacity constraints must be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Layout to take account of sewers crossing site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Development should avoid harm to setting of St Mary &amp;</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>Site</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
<th>Number of Dwellings</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>619b</td>
<td>Land at The Brambles</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sewerage network capacity constraints must be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Layout to take account of sewers crossing site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve pedestrian access to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1080</td>
<td>Land at Glenhaven</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Surface water network capacity issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve pedestrian access to school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Mulbarton and Bracon Ash (Norwich Policy Area)**

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Mulbarton and Bracon Ash 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. Settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Since the JCS base date April 2008 and up to September 2011, no planning permissions have been granted. As the settlements are within the NPA, well-connected to Norwich and with a range of services in Mulbarton, we are seeking to allocate land for over 20 dwellings.

Any development in Mulbarton will need to contribute to improvements to the B1113/A140 junction.

**Form and Character - Mulbarton**

Historically Mulbarton developed with cottages and individual properties fronting the three roads around The Common. More recently, estate development has taken place on a large scale to the south of The Common which has altered the form and character of the village. The Common has remained as a large undeveloped space in the centre of the village and is important in terms of both visual amenity and recreation opportunities. This is a result of planning policies which have sought to prevent development on the edges of The Common in order to preserve its impressive open appearance and allow views out over the surrounding countryside. This has meant that The Common has drawn the countryside into the ‘core’ of the village.

A focal point to the north of The Common is created by the pond and surrounding cottages at the junction of the B1113 and the road to the east of The Common. The view of the church is prominent from all parts of The Common. The special...
character of this area has been recognised by the designation of a Conservation Area in 1977, which was extended in 1994.

Also within the Conservation Area, the area immediately around Mulbarton Hall is important. The wall on the west side of Long Lane to the south of the Hall is an important feature in the street scene. The large trees north of Rectory Lane contribute to the setting of The Old Rectory which is listed.

There is also a good buffer of open farmland between the B1113 and the western edge of new residential areas south of The Common which contributes to the setting of the village.

Form and Character – Bracon Ash
The parish of Bracon Ash lies to the south-west of Mulbarton on the B1113. There are three distinct settlement groupings. The main settlement has developed in a linear fashion along The Street, Hawkes Lane and Poorhouse Lane and comprises mainly frontage properties. It is separated from Mulbarton by agricultural land to the south of Cuckoofield Lane which contributes to its individual identity. Within the village, there is an important gap to the north of Mergate Farm, which maintains the segregation between the farm and the village.

To the west of the village, a small group of local authority dwellings has developed around the church. It is separated from the main part of the village by agricultural land.

Hethel, a separate community within the parish, comprises a scattering of farms and cottages in open countryside to the west of the main village with no real ‘nucleus’. Lotus Cars Ltd. occupies a large site in Hethel and is dealt with separately in this document.

Services and Community Facilities - Mulbarton
The village possesses a good range of facilities, including infant and junior schools, farm shop, GP surgery, social club, village hall and scout/guide hall, convenience stores, hot food take-aways, car MOT garage, pub and children’s playgroup.

Services and Community Facilities – Bracon Ash
The main settlement has mains sewers, a village hall, a children’s playground, bowling green and sports facilities. Other facilities such as schools and shops are available in Mulbarton.

Communication – Mulbarton & Bracon Ash
The B1113 gives reasonable access via the A140 to Norwich, but the east-west links from the village to the employment centre of Wymondham are not very good.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary in Mulbarton was drawn to include the recent development at Cuckoofield Lane, housing at the south-eastern corner of the common, and 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.
frontage development at The Rosery and Rectory Lane. The village hall, Old Hall Farm and the church and rectory are excluded, but there are further small clusters of development with boundaries at the north and west of the common. In Bracon Ash, development at Poorhouse Lane, The Street and Hawkes Lane are included, but Mergate Farm and the small cluster of dwellings off Mergate Lane have been excluded.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
The development boundary in Mulbarton has been adjusted to remove areas which are now within Flood Zones 2 & 3. Two small boundary changes at the Rosery and Norwich Road allow for additional infill opportunities. The development boundary in Bracon Ash has been adjusted to allow limited infill off Hawkes Lane, adjacent to Thistledown.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, and could accommodate approximately 170 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>0819</td>
<td>Land at Norwich Road, Bracon Ash</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>20 dwellings</td>
<td>- Contribute towards B1113/A140 junction improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Surface water supply and sewerage capacity constraints must be overcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1146\S0141</td>
<td>Land off Long Lane/The Rosery</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>150 dwellings</td>
<td>- Subject to suitable access/Highways work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Contribute towards B1113/A140 junction improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Surface water drainage, water supply, sewerage capacity constraints must be overcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Layout to take account of water mains crossing the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* site size as measured on Northgate may differ from that on site database as proposed by landowners.
Newton Flotman (Norwich Policy Area)
Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Newton Flotman 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. Settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Since the JCS base date April 2008 and up to September 2011, permission has been granted for 8 additional dwellings at Olive Avenue.

Form and Character
The main settlement of the parish lies on the A140 in the Tas Valley, where the boundaries of Saxlingham Thorpe and Newton Flotman parishes meet. Development within the settlement is nucleated, with almost all residential development in the village occurring to the north of the river. The valley side development is visually prominent when approaching the village from the south-west. Little development has occurred on the east side of the A140 in the attractive valley floor area of the Tas Valley, and the A140 virtually acts as a bypass for the village. Much of this eastern area is now included within the enlarged Shotesham Conservation Area. Church Road provides a strong boundary when approached from the north with the church being strikingly prominent.

Surface water drainage is problematic in the village, and this aspect must be addressed by any development.

Services and Community Facilities
The main part of the village contains a GP surgery, primary school, village hall, residential care home, motorbike salesroom, stage school and allotments. There is a restaurant to the south of the village, and local employment at the animal feed mill to the south of the river.

Communication
The village possesses a good direct link via the A140, to Norwich and Long Stratton. Any development in Newton Flotman will need to contribute to improvements to the B1113/A140 junction.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary is drawn around the residential development north of the river, on both sides of Flordon Road, to the west of Ipswich Road and to the south of Church Road. This includes estate development between the A140 and the village hall and playing field. The village hall, rectory and church are excluded from the development boundary, as is the animal feed mill and all housing on the east of the Ipswich Road.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
The development boundary has been amended in two places to take account of flood zones 2 & 3.

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 30 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>
| 607     | Land adjacent to Alan Avenue  | 1.3      | 30 dwellings       | • Subject to suitable access from Alan Avenue  
• No overland surface water flows to leave the site which might increase flood risk elsewhere  
• Water supply, waste water and sewerage capacity constraints must be overcome  
• Layout to account for water mains crossing the site  
• Landscaping should minimise the impact on the landscape from the south-west |

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

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.
Spooner Row (Norwich Policy Area)
Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Spooner Row 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. Settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Since the JCS base date April 2008 and up to September 2011, no significant planning permissions have been granted, therefore we are seeking to allocate land for 10-20 dwellings.

Form and Character
Spooner Row lies within the parish of Wymondham. The village has developed as four significant settlement groupings, with agricultural land separating the four groups. The Norwich to Ely railway line runs north-south dividing the two western groups from the other two. The large open spaces between these settlement groups contribute to the character of the village. To the north-east is Suton also lying within the parish of Wymondham. This consists of a small group of dwellings and some small ribbon development.

Services and Community Facilities
The village hall, rail halts and school are in the School Lane/ Station Road cluster; there is a pub at Chapel Road/Bunwell Road.

Communication
Spooner Row has a station on the Norwich - Ely railway line. It has a minor road connection to the A11 providing access to Attleborough, Wymondham and Norwich.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary excludes the school/playing field and the barn conversions off Chapel Road.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
Some changes have been made to the development boundary to remove land within flood zones 2 & 3. A small extension to the development boundary has been proposed at Top Common to allow limited infill development.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, and could accommodate 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>534</td>
<td>Land at Chapel Road</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>10 dwellings</td>
<td>• Design to form a gateway to the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(part of site)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Site may require relocation of sewage pumping station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>967c</td>
<td>School Lane (part of site)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5 dwellings</td>
<td>• Development must not restrict public access to playing field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• TPO adjacent to site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spooner Row (Norwich Policy Area)
Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Spooner Row 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. Settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Since the JCS base date April 2008 and up to September 2011, no significant planning permissions have been granted, therefore we are seeking to allocate land for 10-20 dwellings.

Form and Character
Spooner Row lies within the parish of Wymondham. The village has developed as four significant settlement groupings, with agricultural land separating the four groups. The Norwich to Ely railway line runs north-south dividing the two western groups from the other two. The large open spaces between these settlement groups contribute to the character of the village. To the north-east is Suton also lying within the parish of Wymondham. This consists of a small group of dwellings and some small ribbon development.

Services and Community Facilities
The village hall, rail halts and school are in the School Lane/Station Road cluster; there is a pub at Chapel Road/Bunwell Road.

Communication
Spooner Row has a station on the Norwich - Ely railway line. It has a minor road connection to the A11 providing access to Attleborough, Wymondham and Norwich.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary excludes the school/playing field and the barn conversions off Chapel Road.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
Some changes have been made to the development boundary to remove land within flood zones 2 & 3. A small extension to the development boundary has been proposed at Top Common to allow limited infill development.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, and could accommodate 15 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.
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>Site No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size ha*</th>
<th>Suggested Land use</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>Land at Chapel Road</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>10 dwellings</td>
<td>• Design to form a gateway to the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Site may require relocation of sewage pumping station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>967c</td>
<td>School Lane</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5 dwellings</td>
<td>• Development must not restrict public access to playing field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(part of site)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• TPO adjacent to site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Stoke Holy Cross (Norwich Policy Area)**

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Stoke Holy Cross 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. Settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

**Form and Character**
Within the parish of Stoke Holy Cross there are two main areas of settlement, the main village lying astride the C201 road connecting Norwich and Hempnall in the west of the parish, and the smaller detached settlement of Upper Stoke which lies on its eastern boundary. This latter settlement forms part of the settlement of Poringland and is covered by the Poringland development boundary.

Historically the village developed around the mill which forms the principal building in the small Conservation Area which was designated in 1975.

The village is strongly linear in form and has developed along the eastern banks of the River Tas away from the older historic part of the settlement around the mill. More recent estate development has taken place on the eastern side of The Street where the village has developed up the slope of the valley.

**Services and Community Facilities**
The village possesses a wide range of these facilities.

**Communication**
The C201 provides a direct link from the village to Norwich. This road crosses over the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass, but no access on to the A47 is provided at this point and therefore traffic wishing to access the A47 either has to go via the Norwich Ring Road, Poringland or Dunston, the latter being unsuitable to any increase in traffic due to the narrow nature of the lanes through Dunston to the A140.

**Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)**
South Norfolk Local Development Plan
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The development boundary that was subject to the previous consultations was drawn
to prevent extension of development into the open countryside and to safeguard the
river valley. In addition, it does not incorporate ribbon development at the southern and
northern ends of the village to protect the sensitive nature of these areas.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
It is proposed to largely retain the development boundary that has been subject to the
previous consultations, other than at the eastern end of the village where it is proposed
to extend the boundary to include a proposed allocation (see below) and to allow for
some limited infill development to the east of the school.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, and could
accommodate approximately 75 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>
| 753 (part)/Z1265/139 (part) | Land to the south of Stoke Holy Cross Primary School | 8.2 | 75 dwellings and expanded school facilities | • Vehicular access to the development will be from Long Lane with pedestrian and cycle access also provided to Five Acres
• Open space will be provided on the southern boundary of the site to provide an expansion of the open space at the southern end of Five Acres
• The development shall allow for expansion and improvement of the facilities at the adjoining Primary School |

* 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.
Swardeston (Norwich Policy Area)
Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Swardeston 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. Settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Since the JCS base date April 2008 and up to September 2011, no significant planning permissions have been granted, therefore we are seeking to allocate land for at least 10-20 dwellings.

Form and Character
Swardeston has developed as a ‘street village’ either side of the B1113, with outliers of development around The Common. The historic ‘core’ of the village is to the west of the main road where there are a number of older cottages facing The Common. More recent estate scale development has taken place to the east of the B1113.

The focus of the village is The Common which occupies some 21 hectares. There has been some limited infilling in the surrounding settlement groups but its character as a large, informal open space crossed by a network of unmade tracks has remained, and contributes greatly to the pleasant rural character of the village. There is an outlier of development to the south of the road leading to Lower East Carleton. The landscape to the east of the village is open.

Services and Community Facilities
The village possesses a good range of facilities including a garage, bakery, village hall, bowling green, farm shop and pub, but has no school. Swardeston has the benefit of a mains sewer system and the Swardeston Sewage Treatment Works also serves Mulbarton. There are also problems of surface water drainage particularly on the east side of the village and if further estate scale development were to be considered in this part of the settlement these problems would have to be overcome.

Communication
The village has good access to Norwich via the B1113 and A140, and any development here will have to contribute to improvements to the B1113/A140 junction.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary is fragmented; the largest group excludes Roadside Nursery on Main Road, the larger residences around the church. In addition, there is a development boundary around two groups of dwellings to the north and west of the common, on Intwood Lane and The Common.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
The development boundary on Intwood Lane has been adjusted to allow limited infill development.
South Norfolk Local Development Plan  
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Preferred Development Sites for Allocation

The following site has been assessed as a potential allocated site, and could accommodate approximately 30 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>
| 978d    | Main Road| 2.7      | 30 dwellings       | • Historic Environment Record should be consulted  
• Viability of extracting underlying minerals prior to development to be investigated  
• Water supply, waste water and sewerage capacity constraints to be overcome  
• Subject to suitable access, landscaping & layout |

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

Tasburgh (Norwich Policy Area)

Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Tasburgh 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. Settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Form and Character

There are two main areas of settlement in the parish, Upper and Lower Tasburgh.

Upper Tasburgh has developed as a nucleated settlement as a result of post-war estate development and lies above the Tas Valley which runs to the south. Lower Tasburgh set in the Tas Valley, comprises an older ribbon of development strung along part of Grove Lane and Low Road. With the exception of a small estate at Harvey Close the character of Lower Tasburgh comprises single plot depth development of varying age with significant trees and hedges interspersed with important gaps which gives it an attractive rural character

Services and Community Facilities

There is a good range of facilities which are primarily located in Upper Tasburgh. Outside the parish the Hempnall Sewage Treatment Works, which also serves Tasburgh, is at capacity.

Communication

Upper Tasburgh has a good direct link onto the A140 linking Norwich and Ipswich. Lower Tasburgh’s links to this road are by minor roads, some of which are very narrow.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)

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.
The development boundary consisted of two elements – one enclosing Upper Tasburgh preventing any further extension into the open countryside, and a fragmented boundary enclosing existing linear development in Lower Tasburgh whilst protecting important gaps in the existing development.

Preferred Option – Development Boundary
The boundary for Upper Tasburgh remains unchanged other than to incorporate the proposed allocation (see below). The boundary in Lower Tasburgh is reduced in scale, primarily to remove land which is Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, but also to remove land that is over 800 metres from any services other than a bus service.

Preferred Development Sites for Allocation
The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, 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>
| 511     | Land on Church Road, between the school and Old Hall Farm | 1.14 | 20 dwellings | • Vehicular access to the residential development should be from Church Road  
• Pedestrian and cycle access should be available to the school  
• The development should be designed to allow expansion / improvement to the school facilities if required  
• Safeguarding provisions in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 will apply |

* 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.

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

QUESTION: Please give your views on the Preferred Option site(s) in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) Service Villages? Please ensure you tell us which village(s) you are commenting on.

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.
QUESTION: Have all the policy considerations for the Preferred Option site(s) in the Service Village been identified? If not, please tell us what else is required?
QUESTION: Are there any other designations that should be considered in Service Villages (NPA)? Please tell us which Service Village (NPA) your comments are about.
QUESTION: Please give your views on the Preferred Development Boundary in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) Service Village? Please make sure you tell us which village(s) you are commenting on.

PART B- Rural Area ‘Service villages’

These settlements were agreed by Cabinet 26 March 2012
SECTION 6

Other Villages

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.

Part A - Other Villages in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) Bawburgh, Colton, Flordon, Keswick, Ketteringham, Marlingford, Swainsthorpe

Part B - Other Villages in the Rural Area Aldeby, Bressingham, Brockdish, Burgh St Peter (including part within Wheatacre parish and the adjacent developed area in Aldeby parish) Burston, Claxton, Denton, Fornsett St Mary, Fornsett 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.
PART A - Norwich Policy Area ‘Other villages’

Bawburgh (Norwich Policy Area)
Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Bawburgh as an ‘Other Village’ which will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village. However, settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Form and Character
Bawburgh is situated in the bottom of the Yare Valley between the B1108 and A47. Two distinct settlement groups have developed each side of the river. To the south of the river, frontage development extends along Church Street towards the church, more recent estate development is situated on Hockering Lane, with a detached group of dwellings further south beyond the village hall on Stocks Hill. To the north of the river, frontage development follows the line of New Road and Harts Lane, with another nucleus of dwellings to the west of the junction with Marlingford Road.

The central area of the village was designated a Conservation Area in 1973. The floodplain of the River Yare between the two ‘sides’ of the village has remained undeveloped. This contributes to the valley setting of Bawburgh. Any large scale development would be prominent in the valley landscape and detract from this setting.

At the eastern edge of the parish lies previously allocated open space at the Costessey/Bawburgh Lakes. JCS policies 10 and 12 require the creation of a country park at Bawburgh Lakes, and this site will be re-allocated for leisure use.

Social and Community facilities
There is a recently built village hall on Stocks Lane, primary school on Hockering Lane, church and public house.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary is separated by the river which runs through the centre of the village. The northern section includes almost all dwellings on New Road and Harts Lane, including the small cluster of development at the junction with Marlingford Road. The southern section includes most buildings on Church Street and Hockering Lane, but excludes the church itself. The cluster of dwellings on Stocks Hill, south of the village hall, are excluded from the development boundary.

Development Boundary - Preferred Option
The development boundary has been altered to take account of changes to Flood Zones 2 & 3.

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

Although the settlement falls into the category of Other Village, one site has been identified as being suitable for small-scale development. The following sites have been assessed as potential allocated sites, and could accommodate approximately 5 additional dwellings and around 73ha of publicly accessible open space:

<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>
| 409     | Land at Stocks Hill | 0.37 | 5 dwellings | • Layout to provide minimal visual impact as seen from the Conservation Area  
• Sewerage capacity constraints to be addressed  
• Design to respect context of Conservation Area, River Valley. |
| A0004   | Bawburgh/Colney pits | 73.5 | Water-based country park | • Public access  
• Footpath link with access for major residential developments at various points of entry |

Colton (Norwich Policy Area)

Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Colton as an ‘Other Village’ which will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village. However, settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Form and Character
Marlingford parish contains two settlements. Marlingford village is located in the bottom of the Yare Valley on the outside of a bend in the river. Separated from this, approximately 2 km to the north-west is the settlement of Colton. Historically, the settlement of Colton developed with a number of large farms and small cottages which have been joined up by frontage development to form a distinct settlement grouping. To the south of Norwich Road the buildings are set in large grounds with trees and hedges along the road frontage. The area to the north of Norwich Road falls within the administrative area of the Broadland District Council. Development along The Street is of higher density.

Social and Community facilities

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.
These are limited to a village hall on Norwich Road and a pub on Highhouse Farm Lane.

**Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)**
The development boundary was drawn around the Norwich Road dwellings but excluded the pub and village hall.

**Development Boundary - Preferred Option**
It is not proposed to alter the development boundary.

**Flordon (Norwich Policy Area)**
Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Flordon as an ‘Other Village’ which will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village. However, settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

**Form and Character**
The settlement of Flordon comprises two physically distinct areas. One is situated around the main Norwich-London railway line bridge, and the other has developed further to the west around the parish church. The village has experienced limited estate scale housing development in the form of a small housing estate (St Michaels View) together with some more recent infill development.

The village is characterised by good tree and hedge planting together with significant open frontages which contribute towards its rural setting. To the south of The Street is a tributary valley of the River Tas which includes Flordon Common, an SSSI.

**Social and Community facilities**
There is a church room on the south of The Street.

**Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)**
The development boundary is fragmented, and was drawn to include the estate development at St Michael’s View to the west, and the groups of dwellings either side of the rail track to the east. It excludes the Rectory, church room and a few dwellings on the south of The Street.

**Development Boundary - Preferred Option**
It is not proposed to alter 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.
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Keswick (Norwich Policy Area)

Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Keswick as an ‘Other Village’ which will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village. However, settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Form and Character
Keswick is a very rural parish despite abutting Norwich, with development concentrated on Low Road. To the south of Low Road there is an established frontage between Glebe House and Low Farm. The dwellings on Low Road are located within the Yare Valley but to the east of these there is an important gap which offers views to the crest of the valley side from the south. To the north of Low Road there are a handful of buildings scattered along its frontage. At the eastern end is Hall Farm occupying a prominent location which helps to give Keswick its rural character.

Detached from the development on Low Road are isolated pockets of dwellings including the Keswick Mill area, an attractive area next to the river and designated as a small Conservation Area. In addition there are other individual and groups of dwellings, and farms isolated from the main developed ribbon, set in partially wooded countryside. In the south of the parish, the former education college based on Keswick Hall, which is a Grade II listed building, has been converted to residential use which has ensured the continued use of this important building. The parkland setting of the Hall contributes to the overall attractiveness of the landscape in the area.

Social and Community facilities
These are very limited comprising a small community hall and a bus service along the B1113.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Keswick 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 and omitting areas that are within flood zone 2.

Preferred Option
To define the development boundary of the village as shown to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.
To define a new development boundary at land between B1113 and A140 roads for a new employment land allocation of approx. 4ha. Employment uses to be restricted to use Class B1 for workshops and light industrial uses and the express requirement include provision for an access road through the site from B1113 to A140 at Tesco Harford. Joint Core Strategy Policy 5 requires that sufficient land be allocated in accessible locations to meet the needs of small, medium and start-up businesses. Whilst Keswick is not an identified employment location 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.
overriding needs to make improvements to the junction of the B1113/A140 could be achieved through the allocation of this land.

Preferred sites in the Norwich policy Area to help deliver the smaller sites allowance.

<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>
| 095     | Low Road               | 0.5      | Up to 10 dwellings | • Anglian Water safeguarding zone required to protect existing pumping station assess odour/noise.  
• This may affect the layout of the site and the number of dwellings that can be delivered and needs to take account of the sewers crossing the site.  
• NCC Highways requirement for contribution to junction improvements B1113/A140 |
| 0946    | Land west Ipswich Road | 4ha      | Employment land    | • Restricted to light industrial/workshop type uses (B1)  
• to include provision of an access road across the site from B1113 to A140 at Tesco Harford  
• provision of right turn junction into site from B1113  
• Underlying minerals resource on site safeguarding policy CS16 applies  
• Landscaping/bunding to protect properties to the north |

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

Other reasonable options considered
Due to the flood zone and limited access to social and community facilities there were no other reasonable options 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.
South Norfolk Local Development Plan
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Ketteringham (Norwich Policy Area)
Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Ketteringham as an ‘Other Village’ which will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village. However, settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Form and Character
Ketteringham is a small village which lies to the south of the new A11 and the Norwich - Ely railway line. The village has developed in a linear form along The Street and Low Road. The council depot and waste-recycling/paper recycling plants in the parish are separated from the residential area. There is a smaller outlier of development to the south of the village around the Church and Ketteringham Hall.

Some infilling has taken place along The Street and Low Road, but the total number of dwellings is still small. The setting of the village within open countryside is made apparent by the significant breaks in the built-up area to the north of The Street around the War Memorial and between ‘Cytringa’ and ‘Thatched Cottage’ to the south of Low Road. These afford views over the surrounding countryside. The area around Ketteringham Hall is distinctly separate from the main part of the village. The grounds of Ketteringham Hall are of considerable archaeological importance.

Social and Community facilities
There is a village hall and small MOT service garage. Further employment is available at the cluster of industrial units to the north-east.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary was drawn around the dwellings to the west of the war memorial and village hall.

Development Boundary - Preferred Option
It is not proposed to alter the development boundary.

Marlingford (Norwich Policy Area)
Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Marlingford as an ‘Other Village’ which will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village. However, settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Form and Character
Marlingford parish contains two settlements. The main village is located in the bottom of the Yare Valley on the outside of a bend in the river. Separated from this, approximately 2 km to the north-west is the settlement of Colton.

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.
Marlingford village has developed along two sides of a triangle formed by Barford Road and Mill Road which radiate towards the south west from the junction with Marlingford Road. The junction forms the focal point of the village. To the north-east of the junction is the ‘Old Hall’ which is listed. The area around the Hall has remained undeveloped which contributes to its setting.

The wedge of land between Barford Road and Mill Road occupied by the allotments and The Common has remained undeveloped. This contributes to the rural character of Marlingford as a village set in open countryside within the river valley.

Social and Community facilities
These are limited to a public house and allotments.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
The development boundary was drawn around all contiguous development to the north of Barford Road and the east of Mill Road, but excluded the Old Rectory.

Preferred Option
It is not proposed to alter the development boundary.

Swainsthorpe (Norwich Policy Area)

Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Swainsthorpe as an ‘Other Village’ which will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village. However, settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the ‘smaller sites in the NPA’ allowance.

Form and Character
Development is concentrated between the A140 and the railway line. The settlement is characterised by detached dwellings with the central focus being around the Church and its setting. This is an attractive undeveloped space in the village where development would be inappropriate. Despite recent new development the village has maintained a rural feel which has been achieved by the retention of attractive features such as ponds within the village. Some of this new development has taken place along very narrow and substandard roads.

Social and Community facilities
There are limited facilities at Swainsthorpe comprising a pub on the main A140, a bus which stops on the A140 and a Bowling Green.

Development Boundary (as represented in 2010 and 2011 consultations)
Swainsthorpe 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.

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 Option
To define the development boundary as represented in the 2011 consultation to allow for limited infill development in accordance with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Other reasonable alternative options considered
Due to the limited facilities available and the narrow road network there are no reasonable alternatives to consider.

SECTION 6 QUESTIONS - PART A Other villages NORWICH POLICY AREA
QUESTION: Please give your views on the Preferred Option site, in Other Villages, (where one has been identified), in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) Please ensure you tell us which village(s) you are commenting on.
QUESTION: Have all the policy considerations for the Preferred Option site(s), (where there is one) in the Other Village been identified? If not, please tell us what else is required?
QUESTION: Are there any other designations that should be considered in Other Villages in the Norwich Policy Area?

PART B - Rural Area ‘Other villages’
These settlements were agreed at Cabinet 26 March 2012

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 7
Smaller Rural Communities and the countryside

Only settlements where sites were suggested will be shown in this section. Please note that Great Melton & Caistor St Edmund which are categorised in the Joint Core Strategy as ‘Other Villages’ now feature in this category because the assessment of their services and facilities was found to be incorrect.

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.

The following tables show the sites suggested in Smaller Rural Communities and how they have been sieved. Where a site has been taken forward and assessed against a neighbouring higher order settlement, please go to the Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment tables to see how it was judged.

Where the site not near to a development boundary or built up area of a neighbouring higher order settlement, the site has been discounted if it does not conform with JCS Policy 17 or the objectives of this Development Plan Document.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Planning Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S0145</td>
<td>Caistor St Edmund</td>
<td>Plot between 23 &amp; 27 Caistor Lane</td>
<td>625880/303226</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Assessed as part of Poringland/Framingham Earl. Please refer to the Site Assessment tables in the Sustainability Appraisal Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0146</td>
<td>Caistor St Edmund</td>
<td>Plot adj. 55 Stoke Road</td>
<td>625948/302840</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Assessed as part of Poringland/Framingham Earl. Please refer to the Site Assessment tables in the Sustainability Appraisal Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1199</td>
<td>Caistor St Edmund</td>
<td>Land west of Heath Farm, Caistor Lane</td>
<td>625555/303296</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Assessed as part of Poringland/Framingham Earl. Please refer to the Site Assessment tables in the Sustainability Appraisal Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1200</td>
<td>Caistor St Edmund</td>
<td>Land at Heath Farm, Caistor Lane</td>
<td>625707/303112</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Assessed as part of Poringland/Framingham Earl. Please refer to the Site Assessment tables in the Sustainability Appraisal Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0339</td>
<td>East Carleton</td>
<td>Rectory Road</td>
<td>617790/301928</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0499</td>
<td>East Carleton</td>
<td>land at Catbridge Lane</td>
<td>618645/301826</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0514</td>
<td>East Carleton</td>
<td>Land at Swardeston Lane</td>
<td>619381/303161</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642a</td>
<td>East Carleton</td>
<td>Land off Wymondham Road</td>
<td>617395/302160</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642b</td>
<td>East Carleton</td>
<td>Land off Hethersett Road</td>
<td>617656/302212</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference Numbers</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1073</td>
<td>East Carleton</td>
<td>Land at Avondale House, The Drift</td>
<td>619440/303 050</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1169</td>
<td>East Carleton</td>
<td>Land at Willows, Swardeston Lane</td>
<td>619436/303 253</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0141</td>
<td>East Carleton</td>
<td>Low Common, Swardeston Lane</td>
<td>619455/303 237</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Does not conform with JCS Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0402</td>
<td>Framingham Pigot</td>
<td>land at Pigot Lane/Long Road</td>
<td>626734/303 113</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>Assessed as part of Poringland/Framingham Earl. Please refer to the Site Assessment tables in the Sustainability Appraisal Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0798</td>
<td>Framingham Pigot</td>
<td>land of and around Highways Nursery, Loddon Road A146</td>
<td>628257/303 901</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Does not conform to JCS Policy 17- No requirement for additional Employment land in this location although existing employment uses to be protected. NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0156</td>
<td>Great Melton</td>
<td>Turnpike Fields</td>
<td>611958/307 412</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Does not conform with JCS Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>098</td>
<td>Kirby Bedon</td>
<td>The Old Stracey</td>
<td>627939/305 354</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0163</td>
<td>Suton</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Holmdale, London Road</td>
<td>608882/298 660</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17- Assessed for proximity to Wymondham and found to be too far from accessible services therefore NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Code</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Grid Reference</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Reason for Rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0178</td>
<td>Suton</td>
<td>Eleven Mile Lane</td>
<td>609164/298/661</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17-Assessed for proximity to Wymondham and found to be too far from accessible services therefore NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0405</td>
<td>Suton</td>
<td>land at Sawyers Lane Suton</td>
<td>609754/299/354</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17-Assessed for proximity to Wymondham and found to be too far from accessible services therefore NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0529</td>
<td>Suton</td>
<td>land at Sawyers lane Suton</td>
<td>609549/299/627</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17-Assessed for proximity to Wymondham and found to be too far from accessible services therefore NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0745</td>
<td>Suton</td>
<td>land at Eleven Mile Road</td>
<td>609047/298/801</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17-Assessed for proximity to Wymondham and found to be too far from accessible services therefore NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0897</td>
<td>Suton</td>
<td>land at Eleven Mile Lane adj Oakfield</td>
<td>609039/298/723</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Does not conform with Policy 17-Assessed for proximity to Wymondham and found to be too far from accessible services therefore NOT BEING TAKEN FORWARD</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.
SECTION 7 QUESTIONS
QUESTION: Please give your view on the Section 7 table for sites suggested in the Smaller Rural Communities. Have we correctly identified the sites which do not accord with Policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy and the Objectives of this Development Plan Document? Please make sure you tell us the settlement and site that you are commenting on.

SITES ASSESSMENT TABLES QUESTION
QUESTION: Please give any comments about the Assessment of sites as shown in the Assessment tables in the Sustainability Appraisal Report. Please ensure you state clearly which settlement and Site you are commenting on.

ANYTHING ELSE?
QUESTION: Is there anything else, not already mentioned that you would like to tell us about?

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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INTRODUCTION

Site Specific Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD)

This document will set out where new homes and employment sites will be located over the next 15 years to meet the growth set out in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). (For an explanation of these documents, please see diagrams and explanations below). It will include policies which set out what is required in infrastructure, road/access and other improvements, for the allocated sites to be developed. It will also show development boundaries.

Some features like conservation areas, river valleys, important frontages etc. will be shown on a proposals map in the final DPD and the policy relating to them will be contained in the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document.

All developers will be required to pay a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to make sure the infrastructure, and facilities go with the proposed growth of housing and employment. The Levy will be charged on any new developments. You can find the proposed charging schedule at www.gndp.org.uk. Different charges apply to different areas of South Norfolk. The Levy will apply at planning application stage on most development proposals. Other developer requirements like provision of affordable housing, see Policy 4 in the Joint Core Strategy will also apply.

Wymondham and Long Stratton will have their own Area Action Plans, and specific policies which will set out where new development is located, while Cringleford will have a neighbourhood plan which is being produced by the parish council and will set out its future growth locations. All of these documents will be produced soon after this Site Specific Allocations and Policy document.

About the Preferred Option stage consultation (Regulation 18) of the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD

This is the third public consultation following two previous public consultations in 2010 and 2011. The responses we received were considered when deciding on the proposed preferred options for sites and development boundaries. In addition, we have taken into account the Government’s new National Planning Policy Framework to ensure our site assessment process and sustainability appraisal conforms with this important planning document.

This Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD sets out South Norfolk Council’s Preferred Options for development sites and invites views on these during a new consultation which will last eight weeks. The responses we
receive will be carefully considered and our document will be revised as a result. Then we will produce what is known as a “pre-submission” document which will also be consulted on. This version will be published and comments invited on the ‘soundness’ of the plan. The document and any comments received will be submitted to the Secretary of State who will appoint a Planning Inspector to hold an Examination in Public.

How to comment on the Site Specific Allocations and Policy DPD Preferred Options DPD (Reg. 18 consultation)

The consultation period for this local plan document is XX September 2012 to XX October/November 2012

We invite you to view the consultation document and make comments in a variety of ways:

Website: You can make your comments directly to our website at www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/ldf

E-mail: ldf@s-norfolk.gov.uk

Post: Alternatively, please return the questionnaire response form to the address shown below.

In person: We will be running a series of consultation events and exhibitions at various locations across the District where you can view maps of the preferred sites and take away the consultation document. You are required to put your comments in writing to us before the closing date for responses, see below. A list of proposed consultation events can be found on our website at www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/ldf

Consultation documents and CDs will be available to view at the following locations: South Norfolk Council at Swan Lane in Long Stratton, Costessey, Diss, Harleston, Hethersett, Hingham, Loddon, Norfolk and Norwich Millennium Library, Poringland and Wymondham libraries and at the consultation events.

Please respond by: 5PM FRIDAY XXXX

Further information can be found on our website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/ldf or by contacting us at:

Planning Policy Team, South Norfolk Council
Swan Lane, Long Stratton, Norfolk NR15 2XE
Tel: 01508 533836
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The documents that make up the South Norfolk Local Plan
(previously known as the LDF)
The Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD, along with the Joint Core
Strategy, Development Management DPD and Area Action Plans form part of
the bigger and overarching Local Development Framework (LDF). Since the
Government’s new National Planning Policy Framework came into force in
March 2012, this will now be known as the LOCAL PLAN. Therefore, in the
rest of this document we will refer to it as the ‘Local Plan’.

(DIAGRAM SHOWING HOW IT FITS TOGETHER)

Adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS)
The JCS was prepared jointly by South Norfolk, Broadland District and
Norwich City Councils with Norfolk County Council. It was adopted in March
2011 and its policies within it relevant to South Norfolk are in force. These
policies set out the strategic pattern for sustainable growth and development
across South Norfolk and form the foundation of this Site Specific Allocations
and Policies Development Plan Document. The Site Specific Allocations and
Policies DPD must conform to the Joint Core Strategy.

Development Management Policies
At the same time as we are consulting on the Site Specific Allocations and
Policies DPD, we are preparing and consulting on the Development
Management Policies DPD. These policies will be used to determine any
planning applications and will influence the type and quality of future homes,
help us conserve heritage assets and the countryside for future generations to
enjoy and deliver the objectives of the JCS and Site Specific Allocations and
Policies Development Plans.
In addition, we are preparing a South Norfolk Place Making Design Guide
which will be used in conjunction with the Development Management Policies
DPD. It will ensure developers’ designs are of the highest quality and reflect
the character of South Norfolk’s towns and villages. The Place-Making Guide
will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.

Sustainability Appraisal
Sustainability Appraisal Report including site assessments
European law requires the systematic identification of the environmental
impacts of a plan or programme. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act
2004 has incorporated this into its requirement for local planning authorities to
undertake a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of each of their local development
documents. These include site specific allocations and policies development
plan documents.

SA is an iterative process that identifies and reports on the likely significant
effects of a plan. It does this by testing the performance of the plan against a
series of environmental, social and economic objectives which together define
sustainable development.
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While not a statutory requirement at this stage of the plan production process, an interim SA Report has been produced for public information to show how the SA process has been applied to the assessment and selection of potential development sites. Comments are invited on the application of the SA to the means of assessing the sites to inform the final choice of sites and the statutory SA Report required to accompany the final Submitted Plan.

Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD and conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
The DPD must conform to the Government’s new NPPF. Central to the NPPF is the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’. There are three sides to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. The NPPF wants the planning system to:

- Ensure that sufficient land is available in the right places and at the right time to support economic growth.
- Support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing land for housing, to meet current needs and the needs of future generations
- Create housing that is of high quality, accessible to local services and reflects the needs of local communities.
- Contribute to protecting and enhancing South Norfolk’s natural, built and historic environment, helping to improve biodiversity and respond to climate change.

You will see these elements in our Preferred Options for Sites, reflecting the best option when judged against the assessment criteria and sustainability appraisal.

How the Preferred Options were developed
Previous consultations Autumn 2010 & 2011
Two previous consultations have been held as part of the preparation of this document. In Autumn 2010 we asked for your comments on over 1,500 sites suggested by landowners and developers. We have received nearly 7,000 comments from you which helped us focus on the key issues we should consider when looking at proposed sites. A further 147 sites were also suggested to us at this time by landowners and developers and these were published and consulted on in Autumn 2011. This was a further opportunity for those who missed the first consultation to give their views on all of the sites suggested to us and to give views on specific suggested policy wording.
Your responses to our last consultation resulted in a further 4,000 comments, which were very useful – thank you. These have helped us develop and shape the objectives of the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD and the Preferred Options we are presenting. The consultation also brought a further 74 suggested sites for us to consider. These sites have been included in our site assessment process and we have sought initial views on these from specific consultees where they performed well in the assessment criteria. If any of these sites has become a Preferred Option in this Local Plan
South Norfolk Local Development Plan
Site Specific Allocations and Policies: Preferred Options consultation document

Document, now is your opportunity to make comments to us. These sites have been prefixed with a ‘Z’ so you can identify them more easily.

Where did the site suggestions come from?
Sites suggested by landowners and developers and sites that were part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).
The sites suggested to us by landowners and developers to meet the requirements for housing and employment growth in the Joint Core Strategy have been notified to us at various times during the plan-making process. Some we have been aware of since 2005 and others have pursued their aspirations for their land through the planning applications process (see below).

In addition, the Council, as part of its Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), identified pieces of land in the larger settlements, that it felt might be able to deliver the growth objectives. These sites were pre-fixed with an ‘S’ for ease of identification. Some of these pieces of land were being promoted by a landowner, but the ownership of others remain unknown at this time. The Council will normally not seek to allocate land that is not being promoted by its landowner, as there is insufficient certainty that the allocation will be implemented.

Sites that have gained planning permission
Some landowners of sites suggested to us have also applied for planning permission. Where these planning applications have been successful and permission has been granted, we have adjusted the numbers of houses required in that village/town to reflect this, unless the village/town is in the Norwich Policy Area (see below).
The base date of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for housing required is April 2008. Any planning permissions granted for 5 or more dwellings on any site since this date is taken off the Joint Core Strategy requirement for that village/town. However we have not reduced the requirement for the following:

- permissions for ‘exceptions’ affordable housing schemes;
- any outline permission or renewal of full planning permissions granted before April 2008;
- any land that was allocated in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Please note that a reduction in the numbers of housing required in the JCS may not apply in the Norwich Policy Area towns and villages, where extra land is sought to accommodate up to 1800 new homes which are still to be distributed within the Norwich Policy Area. See the Map below.

Norwich Policy Area (NPA) Villages and Towns
Show MAP of South Norfolk with NPA area shown
The Site Assessment Process

1st stage sieve of sites – conformity to the Joint Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy

All sites suggested to us up to November 2011 were initially assessed to determine whether they conform to the settlement hierarchy of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS).

Where the sites were in a settlement that was classified as an Other Village, Service Village, Key Service Centre, Main Town, Norwich Fringe, or Growth Location the sites were taken forward for assessment and the assessment findings can be seen in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) report. A full list of villages/towns and their settlement hierarchy category can be found in the sections later in this document.

Where the site suggested is located in a Smaller Rural Community (Policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy), and is not near to a development boundary or built up area of a neighbouring higher order settlement, the site has been discounted as it does not conform with JCS Policy 17 or the objectives of this Development Plan Document. However, if the site suggested is located in a Smaller Rural Community (Policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy), and is located near a development boundary or built up area of a neighbouring higher order settlement and is suggested for housing, it has been taken forward to the assessment process and assessed alongside the sites in the neighbouring settlement, to see how it performs. Where the site has been suggested for other uses e.g. employment, mixed use, leisure/recreation etc. the site has not been taken through to the assessment stage. This is because there is no requirement in the JCS to allocate any land in Smaller Rural Communities for these defined uses. Should the promoter of the land be able to demonstrate the site is needed, deliverable and viable in this specific location a planning application may be a better route to pursue.

Please refer to Section 7 to see the table of sites suggested in Smaller Rural Communities and how they have been sieved.

The Site Assessment Criteria

The criteria used to assess the sites, the site checklist, was included in our first Reg. 25 consultation in 2010. It was amended to incorporate comments received and has been themed and related to the Sustainability Appraisal objectives. There are 39 assessment criteria. Sites have been assessed against 36 of the 39 criteria to see how they perform. The remaining 3 assessments will be done after this Preferred Options consultation because they relate to the viability and deliverability of the site. A table showing how each site performed against the assessment criteria is included in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report at www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/ldf. This separate document is being consulted on at the same time and we would welcome any comments you have about it. See question XX

We have also used the responses from the previous consultations in conjunction with the Joint Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal to devise
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the Objectives for the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD which are;

- To allocate appropriate sites for housing and affordable housing, in the most sustainable locations within the most sustainable settlements to meet the Joint Core Strategy requirements.
- To protect and allocate land for employment to promote economic growth and diversity for a wide range of jobs.
- To seek the appropriate re-use of previously developed land.
- To avoid allocating land in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and land with adverse impacts on sensitive landscapes such as Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Areas Conservation (SAC).
- To ensure that all site allocations identify where possible the infrastructure required.
- To ensure that all allocated uses positively protect and enhance the individual character of the area.
- To ensure that site allocations are close to core services so that people have ready access and minimal need to travel by car.

Weighting of the site assessment criteria
In order to assess the sites and weigh up all the conflicting areas of assessment criteria, it is necessary to decide which aspects of the assessment criteria are most important and will deliver the Council’s aspirations for the future growth of South Norfolk. The Council has therefore placed more importance on the assessment criteria that looks at sustainability, accords with the objectives outlined above and the policies in the Joint Core Strategy. Conserving heritage assets and actively managing patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, in keeping with the National Planning Policy Framework. A traffic light system has been used to score the sites’ performance; red, amber and green. For example, a site that is further than 800mtrs away from all services/facilities will score ‘red’ in comparison with a site that is closer and will score ‘green’. A site that is in flood zone 3 area would score ‘red’ for the assessment criteria, whilst a site which is not in a flood zone will score ‘green’. For a full explanation of the assessment criteria and the published assessment tables please see the separate Sustainability Appraisal report.

The Preferred Site Options in your village/town
The following sections of this document are available separately, with maps to download from our website. They show the Council’s Preferred Sites and proposed development boundaries in villages and towns together with supporting text which sets out the policy requirements for delivery of the ‘Preferred’ site(s). All sites proposed to be allocated will be subject to a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge, see page xx and provision of affordable housing required by the Joint Core Strategy (Policy 4). Please go to the appropriate section to give your views.
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Viability of Preferred Option Sites
Landowners/developers who have been promoting their site should now test the viability of their site against the additional policy requirements to ensure deliverability. The Council assume the sites are deliverable and can pay CIL and deliver other policy requirement unless representations and supporting evidence is submitted as part of this Preferred Options consultation.

Reasonable alternative sites
In some towns and villages there are other sites that performed well but not quite as good as the preferred site and these have been identified as ‘reasonable alternatives’. We want to test reasonable alternatives to demonstrate that various options have been considered.
Where a site is ‘a reasonable alternative’ the promoter of the site should also test the viability of their site in preparation of the site being allocated should the ‘Preferred’ site be withdrawn. Promoters of any site should use this opportunity to assess their site using the criteria shown in the assessment tables and provide evidence to demonstrate why their site should be reconsidered.

No Reasonable alternative
Where there are no reasonable alternatives sites in a village/town, this can be for a variety of reasons. Please refer to the site assessment tables in the Sustainability Appraisal Report for more information. In the Norwich Policy Area all reasonable sites have been allocated.

APPENDIX A
Sustainability Appraisal Report including Site Assessments
This report will be a separate stand alone report which is consulted on alongside this DPD. It sets out how the Sites were appraised and contains the site assessment tables.

APPENDIX B
Habitats Regulation Assessment (Appropriate Assessment)
European legislation on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (the Habitats Directive), as transposed into United Kingdom legislation as the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, requires the assessment of emerging plans and strategies that are likely to have a significant impact on a designated European Site of ecological importance (i.e. “Natura 2000” sites).

The Natura 2000 sites are any classified Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC), potential SPAs and candidate SACs. Government policy guidance also includes a requirement for the appropriate assessment of such impacts on Ramsar sites, i.e. wetlands of international importance designated under the 1971 Ramsar convention.

An Appropriate Assessment of the preferred options is underway in consultation with English Nature to confirm the potential impact of the site
specific allocations on the integrity of the designated European Sites. Copies of the relevant stages of the assessment will be available for comment if required.

Background Information and supplementary evidence associated with the production of this Preferred Options stage of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD

- Site Assessment checklist – see Sustainability Appraisal report
- Site Assessment tables – see Sustainability Appraisal report
- Landscape character Assessment
- Draft Place-making guide – see www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/place-making
- JCS topic papers – www.gndp.org.uk
- Historic Characterisation and sensitivity assessment 2009
- South Norfolk Council Annual Monitoring reports
- Report of Housing development permitted since 2008 base date
- Z sites table
Development Management Policies Document

Planning Policy Manager

To agree the proposed list of topics and policies to be included in the draft Development Management Policies Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cabinet member(s):</th>
<th>Ward(s) affected:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Fuller</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail:
- Michael Thornton, x3838  mthornton@s-norfolk.gov.uk
- / Tim Horspole x3806 thorspole@s-norfolk.gov.uk

1. **Background**

1.1. The Development Management policies will form part of the *development plan*; the starting point for all decision making about proposals for the development of land and buildings. The potential scope and purpose of the policies is outlined in the notes 1-8 at the front of the Table attached at Appendix A; the Table proposes a list of topics and policies to be included in the Development Management Policies Document.

1.2. The policies should all be traceable to the Spatial Vision and Objectives found in the Joint Core Strategy, and should be compatible with national planning policies. The policies must be prepared in accordance with statutory regulations; with a separate Sustainability Appraisal process, several rounds of public consultation and a public examination process.

1.3. A first round of public consultation (from January to March 2012) focussed on what the policies should seek to achieve, with a consultation document that explored 40 questions about key ‘issues and options’ to be considered in preparing the policies. These questions reflected the guidance of the Cabinet, the Local Planning Steering Group and a discussion session held in the autumn open to all Members.

1.4. The results of that consultation have now been assessed along with the recently published version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other inputs, and a proposed list of topics and policies to be included in the document has been prepared.
1.5. Once the list and outline content of the policies are agreed by Cabinet the full wording of draft polices will be prepared for public consultation in the late summer.

2. **Current Position and Issues**

   **Impact of the National Planning Policy Framework**

2.1. While the Localism Act 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) have not changed the fundamentals of the plan led planning system, the NPPF has greatly streamlined national planning policy and guidance and introduced some important policy changes, including the introduction of a ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’. Further changes in national guidance, clarification of the meaning of national policy and new case law precedent can all be expected during the period the new Development Management policies are being prepared – thus we are in a period of increased uncertainty and it will be important to maintain a ‘weather eye’ on developments and to take these into account as necessary.

   **Consideration of the findings of the public consultation**

2.2. The representations received and the key findings of the public consultation are summarised in the documents attached at **Appendix B** – the original representations are viewable on the Council’s online consultation system:


2.3. **Appendix B** includes (as Annex 1) a note of a workshop session held with regular planning agents operating in the district.

2.4. The results of previous reviews of the adopted policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003) have also been considered; this included review and comment by officers and members of Planning Committee.

2.5. The Local Planning Steering Group (Steering Group) advise the Portfolio Holder on the preparation of all planning policies and have been closely involved in guiding the content of these policies and the preparation process. The Steering Group have considered the results of the public consultation and a draft version of the attached Table (**Appendix A**), and have made comments for the improvement of a draft version of the Table.

2.6. Scrutiny Committee of 15th May gave pre-scrutiny consideration to the draft Table and consultation findings (as part of the Council’s policy formulation process) and they made further comments (see **Appendix C** for an extract of the draft minutes of their meeting).

2.7. Furthermore, various areas of potential policy have were considered in more detail at a Member workshop event held in mid May, and there is ongoing consideration of the development of the policies by a working group of senior planning and other technical officers.
3. **Proposal and Reasons**

3.1. The Table identifies subject topic, policy content and notes – including reference to important matters to be included in the text of the document. This reflects the proposed ‘preferred’ policy option having considered various ‘reasonable alternatives’; the right hand column identifies some of the alternatives considered. Important notes 1-8 on the first stage outline the purpose and scope of the policies.

3.2. Some of the key issues considered in refining the recommendations are outlined below:

**Planning reforms**

3.3. There is broad agreement on the need to prepare a document with as few ‘generic’ policies as possible and with policies for specific types of use avoided unless strictly necessary. However, there is need to maintain a balance because the NPPF will apply where the Local Plan is ‘absent, silent or out-of-date’. Therefore, generic Local Plan policies must be carefully written to be robust to future challenge that the plan is ‘silent’ on a particular matter. Furthermore, Local Plan policies can have greater focus to local circumstances and objectives and will have development plan status, higher than that of the NPPF taken as a whole.

3.4. It is generally accepted that it is unnecessary to simply repeat the national policies and ‘strategic’ JCS Local Plan policies and objectives that will need to be used alongside the Development Management policies. However, the document should include sufficient explanation and ‘sign-posting’ to the other most relevant policies and considerations to make the document a useful point of reference to all users. Concerns expressed at Steering Group for a summary document can be met by the production of a summary document including the Policies and ‘sign-posting’ Notes extracted from the full document.

3.5. Policies should include relevant criteria to be considered but must give clear guidance and direction when ever possible to the decision maker. It will always be possible for the ‘decision maker’ (whether a delegated officer, Planning Committee or a Planning Inspector) to weigh material considerations in the balance using the principles of sustainable development – to make an exception to the Local Plan where justified – but this must be from a position of clarity about the Council’s expectations.

**‘Presumption in favour of sustainable development’**

3.6. Policies will need to be drafted to reflect the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ and other policy changes and reforms. The proposed policy and explanatory diagram at 1.1 (in Table Appendix A) appears to be helpful in explaining the process of assessing the sustainability of a development proposal.

3.7. There is a good case for structuring the document as proposed in the consultation; starting with a set of ‘cross-cutting’ strategic policies followed by policies around each of the three dimensions of sustainable development.
running as ‘golden threads’ through the sections on economic, social and environmental policies. This is consistent with the meaning and structure of the new NPPF, will make the plan readily useable, and support properly considered decision making.

**Employment uses**

3.8. There is clear support in the responses for the Council’s supportive position on economic growth and for allowing more flexibility for uses other than Business Class uses - (offices, industry & warehousing) to locate at employment locations, but these new uses must be supportive to the particular employment estate or location, providing services to local businesses and workers. It is vital to not create competition with town centres or to undermine planning and economic strategy objectives.

3.9. While the positive approach to the rural economy and existing businesses is well supported, the majority urged degrees of caution or restraint on any encouragement of new business development to locate in the countryside outside of development boundaries or site allocations. Policy at 2.1 will provide criteria and a non-sequential approach to small scale office uses to support rural economic development – larger offices are treated as one of the main town uses suitable for location within larger settlements or on employment allocation sites (see 2.4 and 2.6).

3.10. Scrutiny Committee were clear that specific policy to promote and provide criteria for considering any development proposals necessary as part of promoting increased working from home should be included in the document.

3.11. There was support for safeguarding existing employment sites and buildings, both within and outside development boundaries. Planning applications proposing the loss of existing employment space (or local shops, services and community facilities) should be supported by good evidence (see 2.2).

**Housing**

3.12. Most people supported the use of design guidance of external space, and a 2:1 majority supported the introduction of residential internal space standards of some form, although going forward, a vigorous debate can be anticipated about whether to have such standards and what they should be. Policy at 3.1 provides for this to supplement the JCS housing policy.

3.13. A great majority supported the inclusion of some single storey housing in the mix of new housing developments. The number should reflect evidence from local housing market assessment and also ensure that other special needs are accounted for. Future refreshing of evidence on housing need should specifically address this aspect of need (see policy at 3.2). Significantly a range of comments were made in the consultation pointing to different aspects of the provisions needed; referring to the importance of provision across all tenures, for homes that meet the Lifetime Homes standards (however many storeys high), for homes in specialist supported estates, and also the need to spread some of the
provision around different settlements in the district to be close to existing family networks and facilities.

3.14. Government issued specific national guidance on planning for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Show People at the same time as the NPPF. This gives guidance on the issues that local planning authorities should consider when dealing with planning applications for Traveller sites – which can include the criteria used by the authority to guide the identification of allocated Traveller sites. There is a good case to be made that it is unnecessary to also prepare a Development Management policy for ‘windfall’ or exception sites, however, on balance, it is recommended in the Table that such a policy is prepared at least for the next round of public consultation. The matter can be reviewed in the light of progress on the Council’s evidence for site need and strategy for site provision including a possible Traveller Sites DPD – see policy at 3.4.

**Shopping and town centres**

3.15. The importance of retailing activity to the character of the historic core of many town centres is clear. While the new NPPF is much improved compared to the draft in respect of maintaining a ‘town centre first’ approach, how to deal with proposals for very different scales and types of new out of town shopping arising in South Norfolk does call for a local policy with locally determined thresholds for requiring sequential site assessments and retail impact assessments of new proposals. There is need to recognise the very different issues and impacts associated with very different types of retail proposal found in the district – see 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6 as well as 3.16 in the Table. Representations submitted from retailers recognise the need for pre-application discussion about the precise form of assessment required.

3.16. The proposed ‘thresholds’ for requiring such assessments are lower than the national NPPF ‘default’ thresholds. Lower thresholds will not block all out-of-centre development for ‘town centre uses’ but will ensure that appropriate assessment is conducted before planning decisions are made.

**Conversion of rural buildings and countryside issues**

3.17. The majority thought redundant agricultural buildings could be suitable for conversion to new uses, in particular newer buildings for employment uses with suitable safeguards, for example in relation to the suitability of access routes. In relation to historic buildings, the importance of maintaining the character and visual appearance of the original building was critical, although whether the hidden structure was ‘sound’ or needed to be rebuilt was not generally thought significant. Responses – including those of planning agents – were very supportive a ‘presumption’ in favour of the reuse of rural buildings for employment uses subject to appropriate criteria (see 2.11).

**Localism**

3.18. There were repeated comments about the need for planning decisions to respond to parish council and local community views and community led plans, and to be clear about how Localism will lead to new working relationships with
Town and Parish Councils. At 3.18 and 3.19 aspects of this are considered but no specific Development Management policy is proposed because these are essentially matters of process and statute set out in the Localism Act and elsewhere. However, the regard given to parish councils and community views, plans and policies, and need for pre-application engagement by developers, will both be addressed in explanatory text of the Development Management document and through revision of the Statement of Community Involvement and other guidance. This will need to be prepared by the Council in liaison with parish councils and other stakeholders.

4. Other Options

4.1. The Council is required by the Planning Act to prepare a Local Plan – if the plan is ‘absent, silent or out of date’ then according to the NPPF all planning applications must be determined in accordance with the NPPF and other material considerations, rather than the Council’s own strategy for the district.

4.2. The consideration of all reasonable alternative policy options is an integral part of the plan making process. These are addressed in the right had column of the attached Table.

5. Relevant Corporate Priorities

5.1. The policies will impact on all four the corporate priorities; in particular the proposed policy 1.1 (Appendix A) addresses how the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ will be applied to ensure that all three dimensions of sustainable development are considered in planning decisions. Specifically the policies will help balance and achieve:

5.2. *Priority 1: Enhancing our quality of life and the environment we live in* - by providing policies that ensure the proper consideration of the impact of development proposals on environmental and heritage assets and local communities; and

5.3. *Priority 2: Promoting a thriving economy* - with policies ensuring proper consideration of the economic benefits of proposals.

6. Implications and Risks

6.1. There are no risks associated with the recommendations of this report, however, there are considerable uncertainties about the meaning and impact of new national planning policies and this is likely to impact on the preparation of the policies going forward, with the various opportunities for challenge through public consultation, examination and legal challenge processes.

6.2. Risks can be mitigated by maintaining a ‘weather eye’ on case precedents and debate, engaging with relevant stakeholders, and adjusting the approach as appropriate. It is critical that the new policies are grounded in robust evidence.
6.3. It is also proposed to commence some focussed discussions with the Planning Users Panel of representative local planning practitioners to assist in the policy drafting process.

7. Conclusion and next steps

7.1. The public consultation responses (Appendix B) have been carefully considered as part of the preparation of the Table (Appendix A), and this has been refined to take account of the considerations and contributions of Steering Group, Scrutiny Committee and other Member discussions referred to in above, to produce the version now recommended to Cabinet.

7.2 The Table outlines the topics and policies now proposed to be covered in the new draft Development Management Policies Document. Once agreed, the Table will provide the basis for preparing full policy wording together with necessary supporting documentation of the predicted impact of the preferred policies and the reasonable alternatives that have been considered, ready for public consultation in the late summer.

7.3 The drafting of the policies in full and the preparation of a Sustainability Appraisal of the predicted impact of the policies of will require further discussions with some relevant stakeholders, including the Planning Users Panel.

7.4 The policies and supporting documentation will be drafted for consideration by Steering Group and agreement by the Cabinet in tranches from the 16th July Cabinet onwards, ready for public consultation to commence in the late summer.

8. Recommendations

8.1. The Cabinet are recommended to:

a) Note the findings of the public consultation (Appendix B)

b) Agree the Table (Appendix A) as the basis for preparing Development Management Policies and supporting documentation.

Appendix A
Table outlining topics and policies proposed to be covered in the new draft Development Management Policies Document

Appendix B
Responses and findings from the first Regulation 25 public consultation

Appendix C
Extract from the draft minutes of the Scrutiny Committee – 15th May 2012
APPENDIX A – Cabinet 11th June 2012

SNC Development Management Policies Document – summary list of topics and policies v23/5/12

1. Development Management policies will form part of the development plan (section 38(6) of the Planning Act applies), the starting point for all decision making about proposals for the development of land and buildings. (Other development plan documents will include: the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk; the South Norfolk Site Allocations and Policies Document; and Area Action Plans for Wymondham and Long Stratton).

2. Collectively, the development plan policies will now be referred to as the ‘Local Plan’ and will replace the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003). Where the Local Plan is “absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date” there is a “presumption in favour of sustainable development” – NPPF para 14. Supplementary guidance in the form of Supplementary Planning Documents such as the Place Making Guide will not form part of the Local Plan.)

3. All Local Plan policies should be traceable to the Spatial Vision and Spatial Objectives – found in the Joint Core Strategy.

4. We should aim for a minimum number of generic development management policies looking at general areas of activity and relating to the whole plan area or wide parts of the plan area. We should avoid lots specific policies for different eventualities and specific uses. The policies should be: ‘timeless’ and flexible enough to handle innovation and change; good for 10-15 years; and supported by evidence.

5. We should aim for positive rather than negative policies where possible, which are likely to include criteria which focus on the effects of development proposals.

6. Each Local Plan policy will be supported with a brief explanatory Reasoned Justification (RJ) drawing on relevant evidence, and Notes that ‘sign-post’ linkages to the other most relevant policy documents and guidance. The Local Plan should always be read as whole; it is unnecessary to include extensive cross referencing.

7. The document will be organised in four sections: Strategic Policies followed by a section on each of the 3 dimensions of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental considerations – this echoes the structure of the NPPF.

8. The following table provides: reference number; topic heading; outline of the purpose of the preferred Policy and content; points to be included in the document as Reasoned Justification (RJ) and Notes supporting and explaining the Policy. The Table includes Comments relevant at this stage; and the reasonable policy alternatives to consider.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>Topic area</th>
<th>Development Management (DM) Policy – preferred option proposed. Purpose &amp; content outlined</th>
<th>Points to be included in the Plan as supporting Reasoned Justification (RJ) and Notes</th>
<th>Comments relevant at this stage</th>
<th>Alternative options considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Policy to promote and seek sustainable development in South Norfolk, explaining how decisions will be reached. Policy to refer to a diagrammatic explanation included in the RJ:</td>
<td>RJ - Proposals that accord with the ‘Development Plan’ (s38(6)) will be supported and refuse where they do not – unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where there are competing material considerations to be balanced the benefits and adverse impacts of a proposal will be considered in terms of how it will help deliver the Vision and Objectives of the Local Plan (JCS and DM Policies), ensuring each of the three dimension of sustainability are considered. Gains will be sought in each dimension. DM Policies are arranged along the ‘golden threads’ of the three dimensions of sustainability. RJ - Refer to an explanatory diagram – if the proposal causes an unacceptably significant and demonstrable harm in any one dimension – refuse. Degrees of adverse impacts in any dimension(s) may be balanced with degrees of overriding positive impact(s) in the other dimension(s). Shading in the graphic to express a continuum of grades of positive and adverse impact. RJ- Explain that necessary information must be submitted to enable a positive assessment of impact and sustainability of any development proposal. Particular information requirements will be identified in Councils Validation Checklist or the relevant DM policy, supplementary guidance or NPPF.</td>
<td>1. Delete – policy as unnecessary duplication of the NPPF 2. Whether to include or modify the suggested explanatory diagram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Requirement for adequate</td>
<td>Policy to state that all new development will only be permitted where the necessary utilities, services,</td>
<td>RJ - Refer to securing appropriate contributions through s.106 and CIL</td>
<td>1. Combine this Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 1 – Strategic Policies**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>infrastructure</th>
<th>physical and social infrastructure are adequate or can be made adequate at necessary stage.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Not clear that this is adequately addressed in JCS Policy 7?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.3 Sustainable location of all new development | Policy to help manage patterns of growth to achieve the plan led spatial strategy of the Local Plan (JCS, Sites DPD, AAPs, NDPs):
First, through the **sustainable location of all new development**:
- At identified locations & within development boundaries mapped in the Local Plan (Sites DPD, AAPs etc)
- other site allocations (Neighbourhood Development Plans)

and second, through a **presumption that development proposals outside of defined settlement boundaries will be refused unless** evidence to satisfy:
- specific criteria in the DM polices or
- otherwise demonstrate overriding benefits in terms of social, environment & economy dimensions – Policy 1.1. |
| RJ – to refer to the ‘plan led’ spatial strategy of the JCS seeking to meet identified needs in the locations identified – principally within the NPA and specified settlements & allocated sites or when supported by Local Plan criteria policies, in the open countryside. e.g. Specific DM policies for conversion of rural buildings, ‘exceptions’ local needs housing sites etc.
RJ - to summarise the Policies and levels of development required at settlements in the SNC area and areas of protection. Replacement for ENV 8 and consolidate JCS Policy 17.
RJ – Refer to Core Principles of the NPPF including (para 17.5) which recognises the ‘intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside’. |
| 1.4 Environment-al Quality | Strategic policy **promoting environmental quality and the conservation and enhancement of the historic and natural environment.** |
| Comment       | – a ‘strategic policy’ will supplement the existing JCS policies which by their nature do not fully address the protection of environmental, local heritage & landscape characteristics. A positive strategy is proposed – linking to supplementary guidance to be produced on List Buildings etc. |
| RJ -Sustainable development requires ensuring development avoids or enhances areas with environmental and heritage designations, is not subject to flooding or natural hazards, and |

1. There are alternative options over how to coordinate and conduct further public consultation on the wording of DM Policies and mapping of the development boundaries.
that water and waste facilities are available.

RJ - DM policies and SPD guidance will set out the expectations of the quality of new development; Planning & Design Statement (P&DS) must demonstrate an understanding and evaluation of these defining characteristics and justify the response. e.g. Place Making Guide.

RJ – Refer to the separate control of activities requiring environmental Permit approval administered by the LA or EA.

Notes:

1. It may be best to relocate the General Design Principles 3.8 policy to the ‘strategic’ policies section.

2. Text to make clear that the DM Policies do NOT apply to that part of district in the Broads Authority area where Broads Authority policies apply.

### Section 2 - Policies for Prosperity – the economic role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Topic area</th>
<th>Development Management (DM) Policy – preferred option proposed. Purpose &amp; content outlined</th>
<th>Points to be included in the Plan as supporting Reasoned Justification (RJ) and Notes</th>
<th>Comments relevant at this stage</th>
<th>Alternative options considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Employment sites</td>
<td>Positive policy encouraging new employment development on non-allocated sites to achieve sustainable economic growth – both inside settlements/allocations &amp; outside subject to criteria. Policy criteria for smaller new offices and business space located outside of development boundaries – a</td>
<td>RJ - Define appropriate ‘employment uses’ as principally but not exclusively Business Class B1-8. (Same definition used throughout the Plan.) Cross reference to Policy 2.10 for the accommodation of new employment uses in converted buildings in the rural area. Acknowledge the ‘sustainability’ benefits of improving local work opportunities.</td>
<td>1. Options around policy wording</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sequential site assessment not required for smaller business premises.</td>
<td>RJ – reflect that the NPPF (para 25) that there is a non-sequential approach to rural ‘small’ scale offices and other development, para 26 requires support for sustainable rural economic development. Define ‘smaller’ offices and other business uses as up to 200sq.m useable gross internal space. Comment – Policies for new employment site allocations will be addressed in the Sites DPD. Comment - Increase level of support to new sustainable economic development compared to SNLP EMP2, 4 &amp; 6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Policy to retain the use of sites and buildings currently in an employment use for employment uses – whether located in or outside of settlements. Criteria to consider proposals leading to the loss of sites and buildings currently in an employment use – focus on the future needs of the area as well as past / current viability of the business / development viability.</td>
<td>RJ – Refer to key points of the JCS. This generic Policy will apply to all existing sites and the second use of new sites – the first use being addressed in the Sites DPD. Support proposals for ‘employment uses’ and other uses ancillary and supportive of the local employment area. Comment - Replaces EMP7 which applies protection to sites in the rural area only, to now also apply this protection to sites within settlements of all size. Comment – any preference for a particular alternative use may be addressed as material consideration. E.g. Might pick-up matters raised in a community led plan.</td>
<td>1. Options around policy wording</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Working from home</td>
<td>Policy to support development necessary to increase working from home subject to criteria to access and manage any adverse impacts.</td>
<td>RJ - NPPF (para 21) and JCS Policy 5 encourage innovation &amp; integration of commercial and residential uses within the same unit - but do not address necessary limitations or changes of use.</td>
<td>1. Delete &amp; rely JCS 5 promotion and generic policy 3.15 to manage impact?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.4 | Promotion of competitive town centres | Policy to identify the **strategy and hierarchy of towns and villages in the SNC area**, to support their future vitality and viability and place at the heart of their communities and as preferred location for the ‘main town centre uses’. | RJ - JCS seeks protection and enhancement of commercial premises and services in all categories of centre and dispersed villages. The roles and criteria applied in SNC part of JCS area made clearer to the reader, i.e. After Norwich the main centres for shops and services are Diss, Harleston and Wymondham.

RJ - Refer to the scope for growth at the defined town centres identified for more development. GNDP/ SNC retail studies. Leave potential for the Sites DPD, AAPs and NDPs or Village Plans to bring forward local specific forecasts and strategy.

RJ – Definition of ‘main town centre uses’, including offices, using definition implied by NPPF para 23 |
| 2.5 | DM Policies for managing change and activity in the defined town centres and primary shopping frontages | Two or three **Policies required:**

- Manage mix of retail / non-retail uses within primary shopping areas and town centres to ensure predominance of shopping in the primary frontage and appropriate availability of space for shops and other visitor attractors in the remainder of the town centre

- Manage food and drink uses (Use Classes A3-5) | Comment – nationally there is a decline in demand for shopping floor space, not least as a result of internet trading. However, levels of planned growth in some settlements may steady demand? Sites work has resulted in a few boundary changes and development sites proposals. There is need to refresh 2007 retail study to reflect JCS allocations and economic circumstances and balance capacity. Adjustments to boundaries and policy regime must to be coordinated.

Comment – key point is to maintain vitality and to keep the ground floor space available for the types of activities that present lively frontage and attract visitors to town - including shops but also more cafes, business services etc. Policy must be ‘future proof’ & allow for innovation & only restrict where justified by evidence and to achieve strategic objectives. e.g. control hours of operation to protect quality of life & amenity, maintain an adequate supply of retail floor space.

RJ- new definitions compliant with the NPPF are required e.g. replace definition of a CBA with a ‘town centre’ and consider |

1. Delete & rely on JCS 2. Combine with Policy 2.6 to address in & out of town in one Policy

1. Options around whether to combine or have separate policies for primary shopping area and town centre. 2. Options around the hierarchy spaces with town centres 3. Options
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Proposals for major new town centre uses</td>
<td>Policy for the consideration of proposals for ‘main town centre uses’ which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres; criteria to assess retail impact and require a sequential approach to site finding.</td>
<td>RJ – Necessary site allocations to meet need are included in the Sites DPD and AAPs. If there are insufficient sites criteria will identify a preference for the most accessible edge of centre sites. DM policy to set proportionate local thresholds where sequential and retail impact testing will be required to protect smaller rural towns. Thresholds will require that an appropriate assessment be agreed at pre-application stage. Comment – NPPF default threshold are high at 2,500 sq m, SNLP SHO 2 thresholds are 1000sq.m at Diss &amp; Wymondham and 500 elsewhere. Comment – A nuanced and proportionate approach is required to appropriately &amp; flexibility consider issues such as the format and scale of new out of town proposals. e.g. to address the differences between larger out of town superstores or the cumulative impact of a small increase at a large well established rural leisure shopping destination or a new and less space efficient farm shop. (see NPPF para 24.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Rural economy and diversification</td>
<td>Policy for agriculture &amp; forestry development requiring approval – criteria to address the suitability of the access routes, unacceptable amenity impacts from intensive</td>
<td>RJ - Supportive with criteria to guide how to overcome the constraints at 1.3 above. Policy should expand on scope of SNLP EMP5 to include support for agricultural contractors serving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.8 | Policy for **small scale rural land based activities** – positive support for appropriate change and land based uses in the countryside, with criteria to manage cumulative impact of many small changes  
Policy criteria for **Equestrian use proposals** | RJ - Policy to help apply the ‘macro-scale’ concerns of JCS and Policy 1.3 above to the very small scale development proposals in the open countryside and the issues of **cumulative impact**. Many sites will be too small or otherwise not benefit from PD  
Language to enable Policy to be used to address new trends in rural commercial and recreational activity outside of the traditional ‘commercial’ definition of agriculture and forestry uses.  
Equestrian issues addressed in criteria to - replace SNLP LEI14. | 1. Delete as unnecessary – treat each case as an exception to 1.3  
2. Deal with equestrian uses in a separate policy |
| 2.9 | Policy to support appropriate development at **rural tourist and other recreational destinations** located in the countryside.  
Includes new holiday new holiday accommodation at established attractions.  
Apply to both the expansion of existing facilities and new provision. | RJ – To balance against policy 2.6 above, support the consolidation and expansion of established rural commercial recreation and leisure destinations where these exploit the unique attributes of the location or are located in a location accessible by sustainable modes. Criteria to guide the weighing of economic and cultural benefits against adverse impacts of either expansion or new facilities.  
RJ – Text to make clear that the Council will regard sympathetically the evidence presented in support of development proposals from established successful recreational and cultural facilities in the district that support the local cultural ‘offer’ and economy. | 1. Delete – require exceptional cases to be made to overturn policy 1.3 and 2.6 and applying policy 1.1. Each case on its merits. |
| 2.10  | Policy applying the JCS preference for the re-use of suitable redundant rural buildings for commercial uses – Criteria to recognise holiday accommodation as economic development and to consider when a residential use may be preferable to employment | RJ - Expand on JCS Policy 5 and replace EMP3. Conversions to holiday accommodation may be preferred as an economic use over Business Class uses. | 1. |
| 2.11  | Policy for isolated dwellings in the open countryside – permitting only where there good evidence of a functional need and economic viability to support a rural enterprise, including agriculture & forestry. | RJ - How to demonstrate a positive case to overcome Policy presumption 1.3 above.  
RJ- Criteria to reflect aspects of NPPF para 55 but will add clear basis for applying test so of: lack of alternative provision, functional need; and economic sustainability. (Picks up some of the criteria in SNLP HOU 8 – 9 & PPS7).  
RJ- Basis for imposing planning conditions / planning obligations and design restrictions.  
RJ - If uncertainty about – may approve temporary accommodation.  
Comment – Any other exceptional cases should be made ‘on their merits’ to overcome a policy presumption against isolated residential development in the open countryside. | 1. Delete – rely on all cases to be made as exceptions to Local Plan policy drawing on NPPF para 55.  
2. Linked policy with 3.3 & 3.4 below  
3. Expand criteria to identify other exceptional reasons too |
| 2.12  | Tourist accommodation | Policy supporting permanent tourist holiday accommodation development with criteria to support development in settlements and in the countryside where there is evidence of benefits to local business and | RJ - Address permanent structures including log cabins and facilities. Basis of restrictions on period of occupation etc.  
RJ - Appropriate criteria for approving sites for non-permanent | 1. Divide with separate policies for |
identified needs are not being met, while respecting the local countryside.

Criteria for permitting sites for caravans and other non-permanent holiday accommodation with limitations on period of occupancy, and criteria for approving sites for non-permanent accommodation.

accommodation. Update references to camping and caravanning to address ‘glamping’ and ‘low-impact’ yurts etc.

permanent and non-permanent structures.

Notes:

1. JCS Policy 5 provides necessary promotion of the economy including provision of employment land, promotion of tourism, leisure, environmental and cultural activities and the rural economy and diversification.

2. Sites DPD to include Policies for NRP, Longwater, Norfolk Show Ground and other strategic sites. Unclear if the existing boundaries of just areas for expansion will be designated for NRP

**Section 3 - Policies for People – the social role**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Topic area</th>
<th>Development Management (DM) Policy – preferred option proposed. Purpose &amp; content outlined</th>
<th>Points to be included in the Plan as supporting Reasoned Justification (RJ) and Notes</th>
<th>Alternative options considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Housing quality</td>
<td>Policy providing a ‘hook’ for housing quality and design guidelines and standards</td>
<td>RJ – to include table of internal space standards to address bed spaces and no. of bedrooms. Refer to design guidance for external space - Place Making Guide and other Supplementary Guidance that is to follow. Comment – Alternative basis of standards under investigation – must be supported by robust evidence. Comment - Do not address standards for energy performance and fabric of houses – covered in JCS 4 and CSH and to be</td>
<td>1. Options around the specification of internal space standards 2. Exclude internal standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2 Housing needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Policy for a <strong>mix of housing to meet housing need</strong> to meet latest evidence on need including an element of <strong>single storey dwellings</strong> in the mix.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Notes | RJ – Text at Policy 4 requires a housing mix to meet evidenced need and requires integration of type and tenure by design. JCS text provides the current overall housing mix requirements and references to latest evidence. Sites DPD will include any specific requirements for each site.  

RJ - this policy adds a explicit requirement for single storey housing element to the mix based on evidence – delivery will only follow with the evidence to justify  

Comment – any evidence to support a requirement for a mix on small sites of less than 5 dwellings?  

Comment: mix identified in Policy 4 may need updating after the next Housing Needs Assessment is undertaken to reflect the impact of:  
- Economic changes  
- Cessation of Social Rent, introduction of Affordable Market Rent etc. Safe approach is to require sites to provide % of ‘affordable housing for rent’  
- Mix of sizes of housing required will likely change in response to the new Local Housing Allowance – new evidence to be required? |
| Action | 1. Delete – negotiate for single storey component based on JCS policy and available evidence. |

### 3.3 Rural housing needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Policy as basis for <strong>local rural needs</strong> housing allocations and exception sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Notes | RJ – explain & regularise the established policy and practice of Council using a Cabinet approved Choice Based Lettings scheme. This gives first preference to local people with connections and allocation cascade thereafter.*3  

RJ - Affordable housing site allocations in larger down to Service Villages, only by exception sites at Other Villages. |
| Action | 1. Delete – rely on NPPF and treat all cases as an exception  
2. To |
| 3.4 | **Gypsies and Travellers** | **Policy for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Show People – criteria for assessing windfall proposals** | Comment – note that the NPPF (para 54) provides for ‘enabling’ private housing development as part of an local housing needs exception site – any such case could be made as an exception.  
Comment – in principle this policy applies to G&T accommodation too  
Comment – alternative option 2 – presenting policies for all rural affordable local needs housing exceptions (3.3 & 3.4) and possibly 2.11 (functional need for a rural dwelling) together in one policy or linked policies in one place. Drafting will aim to combine and condense into 1 or 2 policies? Alternatives to be tested at policy drafting stage. | present as linked policy(s) dealing with all rural housing exceptions - 2.11, 3.3 & 3.4. Test at drafting stage. |

| **RJ** | **A specific G&T DPD may be prepared separately if new local research evidence finds this necessary to make provision of sufficient sites & pitches for permanent and transit needs. National policy requires the Council identify a housing need figure, a basis of delivering & an annual monitor of a rolling 5yr supply of deliverable sites. This document should include criteria for identifying the allocation of sites and may be prepared jointly with other authorities.** | **1. Combine policies for 2.11, 3.3 and 3.4 into one. See comment at 3.3** |

| **RJ** | **A DM Policy would contain criteria with which to assess windfall applications and rural affordable local needs exception sites.** | **2. Rely on new national Policy / NPPF** |

| **Comment – Policy H identifies a list of issues the LPA should consider in the determination of planning applications for G&T and TS sites. A key criteria in national policy is that LPA must maintain a five year supply of deliverable sites for pitches. Temporary sites do not count towards the provision figure. New national planning policy appears to mean that the common practice (of Inspectors and LPAs) of granting temporary...** | **3. Rely on Local G&T Sites DPD site selection** |
| 3.5 | **Housing conversions, extensions and replacement** | Policy to guide **housing conversions, extensions and subdivision – within settlement boundaries**. Policy ‘hook’ for new Supplementary Guidance. | **RJ** - Refer to proposed Housing Extensions SPD. Link to and apply ‘macro scale’ principles of JCS Policies and Place Making Guide to individual properties and extensions.  
Comment – Structured 3.5 and 3.6 to address development in settlement boundaries and in the countryside in two separate policies. Alternative would be to have one generic policy for house extensions and a second generic policy for replacement dwellings. Alternatives to be tested at drafting stage.  
Comment – SG can seek to influence design in small scale development allowed under Permitted Development. | **1. Options around how to organise policies at 3.5 & 3.6. Test at drafting stage - see comment** |
| 3.6 | **Extension and replacement of houses in the countryside** | Policy to control the **replacement, extension (and construction of outbuildings for) of dwellings in the open countryside** | **RJ** – Justify distinct Policy approach for rural area – explain any additional mechanism for restricting the design and size of house extensions and outbuildings in the countryside  
**RJ** – Address mobiles homes (HOU22)  
Comment – good evidence will be needed to support Policy and criteria and NPPF  
4. Include criteria for TSP into the policy also | **1. As 3.1** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Policy for <em>residential annexes</em></td>
<td>RJ - Update Policy, cautiously relax HOU 21 to allow new build structures as well as conversions and extensions.</td>
<td>1. Options to restrict Annexes to conversion &amp; extensions only as SNLP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Objectives for design</td>
<td>RJ - JCS Design Policy 2 is expressed at ‘macro scale’; needs to be applied more directly to smaller scale development. Address buildings &amp; street scene. Cross reference to Place Making Guide but avoid being too specific about Building for Life checklist. Must be open to address new national guidance and standards that are likely to emerge. <strong>2</strong></td>
<td>1. Option to make this a cross-cutting ‘strategic policy’ – relocate to section 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Policy to <em>control of advertisements and signs</em>. Address: Rural area, Urban area, Off site, Illumination, Shop fronts</td>
<td>RJ - apply to shop fronts and cross reference to heritage and design policies and Guidance – inc. PMG and CA appraisals. Simplify and combine to replace IMP 19-24. RJ - Refer to and endorse / update the informal SNC guidance notes on directional signage etc.</td>
<td>1. Delete – rely on NPPF policy and advertisement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td><strong>Parking standards and guidelines</strong></td>
<td>Policy from which to set guidelines for car and cycle parking standards and the approach to travel planning requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | RJ – carry forward the Area of Special Advertisement Control – refer to Proposals Map  
Comment – many are proposals agreed under the advertisement regulations where locus its greatly restricted |
|   | RJ – JCS Policy 6 fully addresses the ‘supply side’ of transport measures but less so the ‘demand side’ measures necessary other than reference to travel planning.  
RJ - Must replace TRA 19 Parking Standards.  
RJ / Notes – refer to NCC transport strategy and guidelines, Manual for Streets 1 &2, PMG. Need to better explain MfS etc?  
Comment - Consider approaches taken by Broadland Council and the Broads Authority to parking standards |
|   | 1. Options around the actual standards adopted |
| 3.11 | **Sustainable transport** | Policy to protect and require connection to routes for sustainable modes of transport including walking networks.  
Policy ‘catch-all’ Safeguard sites for transport improvements where adequate evidence that these are deliverable within the plan period or otherwise warrant safeguarding. |
|   | RJ – Good design requires provision for walking, cycling and public transport – including provision suitable for people with mobility difficulties - replace TRA 1 -4. Refer to support Policy 6 and NPPF para 75.  
Comment - Review of Proposal Map designations for cycle and footway links and other proposals yet to be completed.  
Candidates include:  
- WYM 16 - Mid Norfolk Railway extensions |
|   | 1 – Make this a strategic policy?  
2. Options around coordin -ation of consultatio n on policy wording and mapping |
| 3.12 | Policy to maintain the **safe and free flow of traffic** and the Movement Corridors.  
Refer to Proposals Map | RJ - to define the Movement Corridors. Update Proposals Map as required or include diagram in DM Policies?  
Comment - Policy to combine and replace TRA 13 and IMP8. JCS Policy 6 has insufficient detail? | 1. As 3.11 above |
| 3.13 Telecommunications | **No DM Policy required**  
Policy for the **provision of improved ICT communications networks** | JCS Policy 6 requirement for all development to contribute to provision of fast Broadband? What does this mean for a land use policy? Require provision of cable-trunking etc? See NPPF para 43  
Must be 15 years ‘future proof’ – ICT is evolving so rapidly  
Comment – JCS and NPPF is very clear on this - is a local DM Policy is unlikely to add anything significant | Options:  
1 – Include policy  
2 – Include in a policy combining 3.13-14 |
| 3.14 | **No Policy required**  
Requirements for all installation of new telecommunications equipment | RJ – Applications made under Part 24 GPDO ‘prior approval’ process. Applicant should demonstrate that has explored sharing and alternatives? Industry have proposed model policy and the matter is now addressed clearly in the NPPF.  
Comment – generally local communications need improvement and there is no particular local perspective to add on necessary restraint. Local Plan policy not required unless an supportive policy combining with 3.13 is wanted | 1. As 3.13 |
| 3.15 Amenity and quality of life of all occupiers | Policy to **protect amenities of all existing and future occupiers and their quality of life**, including criteria to protect against:  
- Unacceptable overlooking of habitable rooms and loss of privacy  
- Overbearing relationships, overshadowing and loss of daylighting  
- Introduction of incompatible neighbouring uses, | RJ - JCS Policy 7 - All 'development will be expected to maintain and enhance the quality of life...' Aspects....Health- Crime - Education - community infrastructure and cohesion. DM Policy responds by addressing the protection of amenity for all occupiers at this point  
RJ – Considerations apply to new uses being introduced into, say, a residential area, and to new housing and other sensitive | 1. Options around policy wording |
| 3.16 | Important local community facilities, shops and services | Policy for protection and provision of outdoor play and multi-functional facilities and natural open space | RJ - Policy to provide the ‘hook’ for new Guidelines to be prepared. Replace LEI8 – consistent with NPPF para 74, 75. **New evidence required to justify updating**  
Consider adopting the ANGsT standard for access to accessible natural open space | 1. Options around policy wording |
| 3.17 | Policy criteria to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued community facilities, local shops and services inc pubs | Viability assessment required before change of use to another use permitted – consider future need more than current viability / use | RJ - Reflect NPPF Policy 70 to both protect valued local shops and community facilities and ensure their ability to develop and modernise. | 1. Options around policy wording |
| 3.18 | Localism and No DM Policy required | RJ – Explaining weighting and hierarchy of ‘strategic’ and ‘non- | 1. Refer to |
| public engagement | Include text in RJ and address in other documents | strategic Local Plan Policies; the **regard will be given to Neighbourhood Development Plans, Community Right to Build Orders etc; and other village and community plans etc**

RJ - Also clarify approach to community proposals for Local Green Spaces or Community Assets etc. Comment - This is helpful guidance and a statement of support for Localism. *4

Comment – A DM Policy is not needed but a promotional policy could be helpful to explaining and declaring commitment to some of the matters is covered in Localism Act etc.

3.19 No DM Policy required?
Policy promoting appropriate **pre-application consultation** with a requirement for a Planning & Design Statement to demonstrate the impact of that engagement on the design process.

RJ – Refer to Localism Act, NPPF and Policy 2 and 12 requirements for master planning, engagement etc.

Comment – Option of setting a lower threshold to the regulations for requiring pre-app – perhaps a threshold proportionate to size of the settlement impacted? However, on balance better to address on a case by case basis

Comment – this can be addressed by updating the Council’s SCI and undertaking addressing these matters in liaison with parish councils outside of the plan making process.

---

*1 Part L Building Regs (2013) will lead to changes in the alignment of BR and CSH, CSH6 replaced with Zero Carbon Homes. Also see 4.1 below

*2 Harman Review to rationalise national guidance and standards such as Building for Life, interface with SUDS and EA regulations etc?

*3 For exception sites and dwellings within settlements of less than 3000 people priority given to expressions of interest from people satisfying ‘local connection’ criteria. Larger settlements – 1/3 prioritised for people with a ‘local connection’. (Modify scheme for the Covenant with Armed Forces.)

*4 Community generated proposals for Local Green Spaces should be promoted through the Plan Making process.

5 Infrastructure requirements – covered under Policy 20, CIL, s106 changes – anything for DM Policies to pick up?

---

*RIA in RJ of the strategic policies rather than in section 3

2. Combine 3.18-19 have one Policy (in either section 1 or 3) Positive policy of support & commitment to these aspects covered in Localism Act?
## Section 4 - Policies for the Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Topic area</th>
<th>Development Management (DM) Policy – preferred option proposed. Purpose &amp; content outlined</th>
<th>Points to be included in the Plan as supporting Reasoned Justification (RJ) and Notes</th>
<th>Comments relevant at this stage</th>
<th>Alternative options considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.1 | Energy and water | Policy for Allowable Solutions and communal scale energy and water measures? | Comment - DM Policies are NOT required to address building energy / water and performance targets. *1  
Comment - Currently unclear but there may be a need for the LPA to manage the new ‘Allowable Solutions’ – a carbon off-set payment performance shortfall against the new Zero Carbon Homes performance standard - funded by developer contributions from period 2013-16 onward?  
Comment – This may not be an issue for DM Policy but for Building Regulations? Could be left for later documents? On balance consider it worthwhile to get the issue out now for discussion with stakeholders? | | 1. Delete and leave to be addressed by others  
2. Combine with 4.2 |
| 4.2 | | Policy(s) to promote commercial scale and community scale energy solutions. Policy hook for guidance on wind turbines, and other energy generation plant such as anaerobic digestion. Refer to Guidelines. | RJ – Generic policies will apply to the impact of such proposals. In addition, use this specific policy to give material weight to the SNC Wind Turbine Sensitivity Study for the purpose of assessing the impact of proposals. Similarly the Guidelines adopted by adjoining local authorities and the impending Broads Authority guidelines. Exceptionally - make cross reference to 3.15 above.  
Comment - May require further guidance for smaller scale turbines, anaerobic digestion etc? | | 1. Combine with 4.1 |
| 4.3 | Flooding, water and scarce resources | Policy(s) for development in all areas of flood risk or important to water supply | Comment - NPPF and NPPF Technical Guidance includes considerable detail – a DM Policy may not add much of significance. (Flood Zones are NOT to be shown on the Proposals Map.) | | 1. Delete – rely on Technical Guidance to NPPF |
However, Local Plan polices could address:
- Local surface flooding,
- fluvial flooding and
- small element of tidal flooding in the district.

Policy should also restrict development adversely affecting the integrity of all flood defences and drainage, and Water Protection Zones, and upon Broads Authority planning area & neighbouring authorities.

RJ – To stress need for an iterative design process of site and SUDs design. Refer to the SUDS Approval Body (SAB) & National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems.

| 4.4 | Recycling and waste | Policy for waste and recycling facilities in all development, covering:
- Access
- Provision
- Requirements for communal facilities as part of larger development | RJ - Policy ‘hook’ for Guidance and requirements to be prepared by other relevant authorities and departments |

1. Combine into the design principles policy 3.8

| 4.5 | Natural environmental assets | Policy(s) to ensure all development has regard to the protection and enhancement of designated environmental assets – including all national and local designations to be included on the Proposals Map | RJ - Proposals will be required to demonstrate an understanding of the significance of environmental assets, consider the impact of the proposal and mitigate adverse impact. Proposals with an unacceptable impact will be refused.

RJ - Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC Act) – LPA has a duty to protect and enhance relevant ‘highest order’ assets.

RJ - The total range of environmental and heritage assets include:
- identified protected and important trees, hedgerows,
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>woodlands, County roadside nature reserves, archaeology and buildings (not shown on the Proposals Map); other designations to be shown on the <strong>Proposals Map</strong>, including; SSSI, County Wildlife Sites, Local Nature Reserves, Special Areas of Conservation, Comment – SNLP ‘catch-all’ designations of Important Frontages (IMP4) and Protection of Important Spaces (IMP 5) require review. These were consulted upon in the Sites DPD – now propose bringing these into the DM policies. Comment - Possible deletion of the IMP4 Frontages – better evidence in PMG, CA Appraisals etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.6 | **Landscape character** | **Policy(s) with criteria to assess the impact of development proposals on the wider landscape and landform** | RJ - Give status of the SNC Landscape Characterisation Study 
RJ - Require applicants demonstrate an understanding of the significance of the landscape characteristics, consider the impact of the proposal and mitigate adverse impacts on the character areas and river valleys. Proposals with an unacceptable impact will be refused. 
RJ – refer to the landscape of South Norfolk characterised by ‘big skies’ by day and ‘dark skies’ by night. Also – guide on adapting to climate change. 
Comment – To encompass advise to be received from Chris Blandford Assoc. on the wording of Policy criteria, to replace IMP 2, ENV1,2 and review the policy approach to Norwich Southern Bypass Protection Zone, Strategic Gaps, and Landscape Characterisation areas. Under consideration. |
|   |   | 1. Options under considerati on on how best to organise policies for landscape etc  
2. Other policy options dependant on advice from CBA. Under considerati on. |
| 4.7 | **Landscape design, trees and hedges** | **Policy setting criteria for the protection of significant trees and hedgerows** and the design of site landscaping and planting  
Policy to promote the protection and where appropriate the replacement of ‘significant’ trees and hedgerows.  
Discourage development that would result in the loss of ancient hedgerows of Dickleborough or 10m or more of an **important hedgerow** elsewhere. | RJ - Design for site to reflect site and surroundings and reflect Guidance in the Landscape Characterisation Study and ongoing work by CBA consultants.  
RJ – to define ‘significant’ trees and woodland (veteran, ancient or subject to TPO) and ‘significant hedgerows. Applicant seeking to remove a 10m section of hedgerow that could be protected under the Hedgerow Regulations 1995 required to demonstrate that the hedgerow is not ‘important’ under the terms of the Regulations.  
RJ- Refer to the particular importance of hedgerows and old trees to biodiversity and habitats in the agricultural landscape – Norfolk BAP refers. |
| 4.8 | **Heritage Assets** | **Policy(s) for designated heritage assets, including Listed Buildings and archaeological sites** | RJ - Proposals will be required to demonstrate an understanding of the significance of heritage assets, consider the impact of the proposal and mitigate adverse impact. Proposals with an unacceptable impact will be refused. Refer to 1.4 above, NPPF (para 58 and 126) – positive strategy for conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. Place Making Guide. (See English Heritage comments) Combine aspects of IMP 11-15  
RJ - Ancient Monuments, Historic Parklands, Conservation Areas identified on the Proposals Map, plus LBs, archaeology and other heritage assets not shown on the map |
| 4.9 | **Policy for Conservation Areas** – criteria for considering applications for demolition, alteration, extension & new development | RJ - As 4.8, combine aspects of IMP 16-18 | 1. Options around policy wording |
| 4.10 | **Policy for development impacting on non-designated heritage assets** | RJ - As 4.8. General promotional / protection policy in relation to impact on other assets. Require Heritage Statement &/or Planning and Design Statement (P&DS) to explain impact and | 1. Options around policy wording |
Policy 3 sets building fabric, energy and use of water performance targets – however these will be superseded by Part L Building Regulations 2010 and 2013. Part L Building Regulations (2013) will lead to further re-alignment of BR and CSH; CSH6 to be replaced with Zero Carbon Homes. 2006 CSH3 = 2010 BR. 2013 BR will = fabric and energy elements of CSH5. Zero Carbon Homes to replace CSH6? Similarly – for non-residential buildings LEED, SKA introduced and BREEAM changing. Do not address energy and water in the DM Policies.
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Development Management Policies Document

First Regulation 25 public consultation findings

1. Purpose

This report summaries the findings of the first Regulation 25 ‘issues and options’ public consultation conducted into the proposed Development Management policies.

2. Programme

The work programme to date has provided for:

- All Member discussions in the last quarter of 2011 to identify key issues to be addressed through the public consultation and what the policies should seek to achieve
- Cabinet approved the consultation documents in December 2011 with the benefit of the advice from Local Planning Steering Group
- Public consultation conducted for an 8 week period running 23rd January to 16th March 2012. This included an information session for Parish and Town Councils and a workshop session with planning practitioners regularly active in the district.

3. Form of response

904 responses were made by 62 parties, the parties were:

- 23 Parish and Town Councils
- 7 Other Authorities
- 6 Government Agencies and Utilities
- 14 Commercial bodies or planning agents
- 9 Individuals
- 3 Special interest groups

The responses are summarised below in the order of the themes and 40 questions laid out in the consultation document, that is, sections addressing: first principles, followed by the three dimensions of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental – and section on ‘anything else?’


In addition a discussion session was conducted with 19 local planning agents and representatives of the development industry – this meeting focussed on 6 of the questions and a note of the meeting is attached below as Annex 1.
The 40 questions posed in consultation reflect the findings of the earlier Member discussions which identified the key issues for exploration in the consultation questions. It was made clear at Question 40 that the consultation was not in anyway ‘closed’ to these matters only and that the non-inclusion of an issue did not mean it was unimportant.

4. Responses received

The issues posed and responses received are summarised below:

SECTION 1 - POLICIES WITH FIRST PRINCIPLES

Presumption in favour of sustainable development (Qs.1-3)

Summary of the issues: The questions asked about ‘what do you think makes a development sustainable?’ and whether a proposed draft Policy FP1 was helpful in explaining how the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ will be applied in South Norfolk?

Summary of responses: Responses identified many different important features of sustainable development including for example: meeting housing need, meeting infrastructure requirements, matching workforce and employment requirements, promoting sustainable travel patterns, ensuring the right location of development, and strong policies to conserve and protect of local character and environment alongside the positive ‘presumption’.

Responses referred to the original Brundtland definition, the four aspects of sustainability identified in PPS1, and the five principles of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy 2005 as well as the three dimensions of sustainability referred to in the NPPF: economic, social and environmental. The need to consider the short, medium and long term benefits and adverse impacts were stressed by several.

There was general support of a ‘first principles’ policy to help clarify the meaning of all this and to apply the ‘presumption’ locally, so long as that were consistent the final form of the NPPF. A significant number of respondents said it will be necessary to await the NPPF before drafting the policies. However, several commented that a policy was unnecessary and should be left to the NPPF.

Sustainable location of development (Q.4)

Summary of the Issue: A draft Policy FP2 was offered for the sustainable location of development. Development should be either in the defined settlement boundaries (reflecting the wider JCS growth strategy) or outside of these limits only when it accorded with specific policies of the Plan or there was an overriding need or benefit that achieved the sustainable development objectives of Policy FP1.
Summary of responses: Of the responses a small minority considered the Policy unnecessary and a duplication of the JCS; the majority considered it necessary and clarifying addition to the JCS. Some representations considered the Policy offered too little protection outside of settlement limits. Suggested amendments and additions were:
That the policy include a full list of the settlements together with the types of spatial policy applying in each (Breckland Council – supported this view, referring to the comments of the Inspector into their Sites DPD).
That greater importance should be placed on the availability of public transport to identify some locations more sustainable.
That reference should be made to Neighbourhood Plans and Parish Plans in the second part of the Policy, reflecting Localism and that these documents might support the case for development outside of settlement limits.

The Supporting information required with planning applications (Q.5)

Summary of the issue: The question asked whether the Council should adopt a policy that meant that the failure to provide adequate supporting documentation with which to assess the sustainability of a proposal should lead to refusal.

Summary of responses: The need for the Council to be clear about what information was required with applications was very widely supported amongst the responses. However, while a significant minority supported the proposal for a policy on this the majority either objected or felt that the objectives would be better achieved by:
Including reference in the lower case text of Policy FP1 to the importance of necessary information
By effective pre-application discussion
By the Council maintaining an up to date Validation Checklist for planning applications with clear requirements in Polices for additional information for particular types of planning applications where this was necessary.
Anglia Water made specific request for the details of surface water management to be included on the Checklist.

SECTION 2 – POLICIES FOR PROSPERITY

Business and economic development

Increasing flexibility for the uses accepted on commercial estates (Qs.6 & 7)

Summary of the issue: Existing SNLP is restrictive about the uses that can take place on employment sites; the JCS seeks more flexibility. How should the Council make the development management policies more flexible?

Summary of the responses: Amongst the responses there was general support for increasing the flexibility to allow ancillary uses to locate at commercial industrial estates, with a number of caveats:
The first consideration should be to protect nearby town centres and to not set up conditions leading to inappropriate competition – what uses were acceptable would depend to a degree on the proximity of neighbouring towns and villages, local pubs and restaurants etc. Some commented that a ‘sequential’ approach should be followed with suitable evidence to be submitted with planning applications on the proximity of alternative facilities. ‘A’ Class uses in particular should be carefully managed although ‘trade counter’ uses may have a useful role to play in some circumstances.

The majority felt that the support services should be ancillary to and support the businesses and workers on the particular estate – although these could cover the whole range of economic, social and environmental needs including small shops, training, health and crèche facilities for example. (On the other hand a minority commented that the uses could be useful to local residents and help build relationships with local communities in some certain circumstances.)

The priority should remain for ‘proper’ employment uses and maintaining the right balance of activities and standards of appearance and quality on the estate. Uses should be compatible with the character and uses on the estate – it should not include an ‘old peoples home’ for example.

The economic objectives should not be undermined by a too ‘loose’ an approach. Breckland Council referred to the particular importance of the ‘REV Active’ project supporting motorsport –related industry at Hethel and Snetterton Heath and the wider spin-off benefits in the A11 corridor.

A specific reference was made to the creation of a flag-ship food and farming hub focussed at Easton and the mix of uses that could come forward with such a proposal.

Assessing the economic viability of premises for future business use (Q.8)

**Summary of the Issues:** There are many sites and buildings scattered throughout the district that are in a business or employment generating use, many are in good sustainable locations. The question explored the situation of a new non-employment use now being proposed – how could the Council reliably assess the economic viability of the premises for future use?

**Summary of Responses:** All the comments received recognised the issue as one of concern but fell into two similar sized broad groups.

The first group responded directly by suggesting various forms of evidence including: evidence of marketing through a reputable agent, provision of accounts, cash flow information or even seeking an opinion from a third-party independent expert. Several cautioned against the use of ‘banks’ risk and investments assessments. One respondent suggested seeking information form the local Parish Council on the circumstances of the applicant. (At a workshop event with Planning Agents it was also suggested that future viability could be better assessed with a formula development appraisal calculation rather than requiring extended period of marketing etc.)
The second group approached the issue differently looking at it ‘in the round’ and considering that the decision should be based on what the area needed now and in the future, looking at all three aspects of sustainability and the future plans / needs of the area. This should include reference to sources including Neighbourhood Plans and Parish Plans. One respondent went further still and considered that a specific policy for this eventuality were not needed; rather the Council should rely on an enhanced version of Policy FP1 (Qs 1-3 above) assessing the benefits and adverse impacts in all three aspects of sustainability – plus a few generic policies on amenity, transport and design etc. (This respondent made a similar point in response to a number of questions.)

Promotion of home based businesses (Qs.9 & 10)

Summary of the Issues: The Council is keen to support new ways of working and more home based businesses but would a promotional policy be useful and what criteria is needed to protect against potential adverse impacts? Are respondent s aware of any good practice or examples?

Summary of Responses: In the comments received no one wanted to discourage increased home working but the clear majority called for criteria to ensure:
- all types of potential adverse impact on residential neighbours were properly assessed to ensure the business was suitable for a residential area (e.g. character, amenity, visual intrusion, traffic, noise, hours of working, odour and lighting and other environmental controls) – including consideration for community views
- that the use should not grow beyond an appropriate scale, and
- that the vitality and viability of commercial areas should not be adversely affected by the cumulative effects many such small businesses.

Few examples of good practice were offered; local home based businesses mentioned were dog kennels and egg production which have not been without problems. One referred to the BedZed development in Sutton and another looked at the issue the other way around, and referred to the example of Maastrict where residential uses had been successfully introduced into areas of under-occupied commercial space to create a more lively town centre with social and commercial benefits.

Vitality and viability of town centres and the use of redundant rural buildings

The need to locate new shops and town centre uses in town centres (Qs.11 & 12)

Summary of the issue: The draft NPPF proposed softening the sequential approach of ‘town centres first’ and it’s application to all ‘town centre uses’ – the consultation question explored view on this. Subsequently, the NPPF has been published and a clear ‘town centre first’ for all ‘town centre uses’ including shops services and offices has been reintroduced , to a degree superseding the need for the question.
The NPPF proposes a ‘default’ 2,500 threshold for the requirement to carry out a sequential assessment – Q12 explored whether a lower threshold was appropriate in the context of smaller towns?

**Summary of Responses:** While the position of the NPPF has now clearer than at the time of consultation the comments included points to take forward in policy consideration:

- English Heritage referred to the Portas Review of high street retailing that recognised the importance of retailing activity to the character of the historic core of many town centres. South Norfolk has a number of such small towns that could be adversely affected by the drawing away of retail trade from the historic core; weight should be given to this heritage consideration.
- A number of planning agents and Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd pointed to the importance of the developer and Council working together to consider the suitability of sequentially preferable sites in the assessments.
- One respondent stressed that some retail and leisure uses such as garden centres were not suitable for town centre locations.

A variety of suitable ‘local’ thresholds were mentioned in responses, these related to either floorspace (5,000sf/500 sq.m or a figure reflecting the average size shop in the relevant high street) or the number of employees (an SME or ‘more than 3 employees’). Several referred to the difficulty in comparing different types of retail business with very different ratios of turnover t/floorspace and the business efficiencies of a say a family run farm shop enterprise against small stores belonging to national multiples such as a Tesco Metro.

**Conversion of redundant rural buildings (Qs.13-15)**

**Summary of the issues:** The questions explored the circumstances and conditions in which conversion of both modern and historic rural buildings to another use should be supported, and when a use other than employment use would be preferable.

**Summary of responses:** The majority of comments were supportive of conversions subject to various criteria listed below. A couple of responses suggested that redundant ‘ugly’ modern farm buildings should simply be removed and not replaced and at the other extreme, that very low or small older rural buildings could be significantly extended in height or footprint. One responded felt a policy to deal with this eventuality was unnecessary and that reliance should be placed on the Policy FP1 and generic design and transport policies. Several said that cases should all be dealt with on a ‘case by case’ basis.

Constraining factors on reuse for employment use referred to included:
- The impact on surrounding landscape (including cumulative effects), environment and the amenities of neighbours; including lighting, hours of use and signage. Also, the adequacy of basic services including foul drainage infrastructure
- The scale of the new use and the availability of services nearby
• Parking, sustainable transport services and access including the and nature of
vehicle movements likely to be generated the routeing to the nearest ‘A’ and
‘B’ class roads
• The Environment Agency pointed to flood risk – it was recognised that flood
resistance and resilience measures may be appropriate in the case of
conversions in areas of flood risk.

A number of comment were made about when a community use might be preferable;
referring to the significance of the lack of availability of facilities locally and the
aspirations of Parish Plans and Neighbourhood Plans as reflections of public
support for reuse of buildings for such proposals. Parish Councils might also identify
buildings as ‘community assets’.

In relation to the conversion of historic and older buildings many referred to the
critical importance of maintaining the character and visual appearance of the original,
although whether the hidden structure was ‘sound’ or needed to be rebuilt was not
generally thought to be significant. Natural England drew attention to the importance
of understanding the impact on wildlife inhabiting redundant buildings and yards
including protect species to which licensing procedures apply; they drew attention to
their ‘Biodiversity Planning Toolkit’ to help incorporate biodiversity into development.
English Heritage drew attention to the Practice Guidance available on the HELM
website in relation to rural building conversions.

Sustainable location of development, transportation and infrastructure

Maximising development in the most sustainable locations (Q.16)

Summary of the issue: Policies should direct development to the most sustainable
locations but should higher building and densities be encouraged at the most
sustainable locations with a design justification for anything above 2 storeys?

Summary of responses: Of the responses only one supported any form of
‘presumption’ for development to not exceed two storeys. The vast majority
supported encouraging higher densities of development at the most sustainable
locations (taking account of a range of factors), but that this should respond to the
characteristics of the site and surroundings and not any ‘blanket’ standard. A
number of comments suggested the inclusion of density standards on Site Specific
allocations to ensure site potential is realised.

When to allow employment uses to locate outside of settlement boundaries?
(Q.17)

Summary of the issue: Of the responses the majority urged varying degrees of
cautions or restraint on encouraging any development outside of settlement limits and
site allocations— they limits should remain precisely this. A small number of
exceptions were referred to including buildings for agricultural use, those connected
with work or buildings of historical importance. One commercial respondent pointed
to the need to not undermine site allocations by then supporting speculative
proposals elsewhere – the onus should be placed on such developers to demonstrate why a speculative development outside of boundaries should be supported. Another referred to the potential for a ‘new’ site to come forward and replace an allocated site that had become ‘stuck’ – there should be a process to review Site Boundaries and Site Allocations to facilitate this.

Several respondents misinterpreted the question and referred to the case for exceptional rural housing whereas the question related to employment uses.

**Broadband and communications infrastructure (Q.18)**

**Summary of the issue:** The JCS requires all development to contribute to the provision of improved fast Broadband connections, the question explored whether development management policies could usefully contribute to this?

**Summary response:** The responses agreed to the importance of fast Broadband and to ensure provision made was suitably ‘future proof’ to new innovations. The desirability of development providing necessary ductwork and for CIL to provide necessary exchange network capacity was mentioned by several. Fibre optic connection was recognised as impractical in some rural locations where enhanced wireless connection was required. Interestingly, several saw the impact of new development / users on existing users Broadband speeds as an aspect of a location’s lack of capacity for new development.

A significant minority of the responses felt this was not a matter for development management policies and that provision should be a matter for the provider companies / utilities and CIL.

**SECTION 3 - POLICIES FOR PEOPLE**

**Policies for housing**

**Ensuring delivery of sufficient housing (Qs. 19-21)**

**Summary of the issue:** Three questions explored responses to a proposed Policy H1 which was drafted to ensure delivery of necessary housing numbers, and in particular this proposed a contingency criteria to deal with planning applications in the event of the Council not having the necessary five year supply of available housing sites. (The policy was prepared in response to the draft NPPF which was suggesting that no local plan policies would apply in such a situation and only the NPPF. However, this threat was not carried forward into the published version of the NPPF and the need for the policy now needs to be re-evaluated.)

**Summary of responses:** The responses are nonetheless interesting in revealing priorities. The great majority of respondents thought the policy had value and provided a useful link to the JCS spatial strategy as it applies to the distribution of
housing in SNC. It was also said that the Council should be explaining what it will do in the event of a shortage of sites.

A virtually unanimous view was that a lack of a five year supply should not mean good locally agreed sustainable planning principles should be abandoned, and that local priorities should apply. The most frequently mentioned priorities were:

- The need to avoid coalescence between settlements and ribbon development, and to maintain the essential rural character of the district and the identity of individual places
- Local infrastructure capacity should not be exceeded
- That no place should not be overwhelmed by the scale or character of new development
- That environmental and heritage assets should be protected
- That local opinion including Parish Council and village and neighbourhood plans should not be ignored.

Ensuring the quality of housing (Qs. 22-24)

Summary of the issue: Three questions explored what guidance and standards the Council should apply to external space and internal space in new housing development. Further, if internal standards are applied, what form should they take? A Policy H2 was proposed to include objectives and expectations for design of external space and minimum standards for internal space.

Summary of responses: Most people supported design guidance of external space, with less support for external space standards. A minority of respondents objected to guidance too. The importance of avoiding prescription and formulaic design and providing for market choice and ensuring consultation with parish / town councils and local people in the design process were stressed by many. Key issues to be addressed in guidance included:

- Minimum off-street parking standards
- Adequately sized streets for service and emergency vehicles alongside any street parking and pedestrian safety
- Utility space, including waste recycling provision (at household and local communal levels)
- Gardens that provide privacy and play space for small children
- Design that creates a sense of place and a distinct rural or urban character depending on location.

In relation to the prescription of internal space standards of some form there was 2:1 support – this was not entirely a case ‘communities for’ motivated by negative factors and ‘housing industry against’. The support ranged from those wanting minimum bedroom sizes to those wanting the standards to be applied with flexibility. Those against stressed: that minimum standards can become a ‘norm’; the need for market choice; for house builders to be able to use their knowledge and to respond to changing patterns of demand; the availability of other minimum controls; and the likely increase in housing costs if minimum standards are applied.
The majority of those supporting some form of standard thought it should be statutory rather than guidance; the only alternative source to the HCA quality indicator mentioned was the recent RIBA publication.

**Meeting the housing needs of older people (Qs.25 & 26)**

**Summary of the issues:** Two questions explored: how the mix of housing should best meet the needs of young and old and whether it should include single storey houses; and whether existing policies for residential annexes should be relaxed?

**Summary of responses:** A great majority of the responses to the first question on housing mix supported the inclusion of some single storey accommodation. This should reflect local housing market assessment and also ensure that other special needs are accounted for. Several comments suggested a need for some specialist estates of sheltered single storey houses for special needs and for owner occupation, located close to appropriate facilities; others stressed the need to spread accommodation in order to house people close to their existing family network. The Environment Agency pointed to the particular vulnerability of single storey accommodation to flooding.

Of those responding to the question about Annexes the great majority were against further relaxation of policy.

**Design**

**Design quality (Qs.27 & 28)**

**Summary of the issues:** Two questions looked at the setting of general objectives and expectation of good design with a Proposed Policy D1 to sit with the Place Making Guide. Q 28 explored how the Council might promote innovative modern design that respects local character?

**Summary of responses:** General support amongst the responses for an objective based policy to support the Place Making Guide SPD and to apply JCS Policy 2, with some suggestions for improving the wording. One addition suggested was to refer to introducing the planning of SUDS ‘management train’ to the ‘base layer’ of the design process.

In terms of encouraging the best in new design a variety of comments on: the challenges that new high standards of building fabric and energy performance places on continuing vernacular design; the dangers of poorly executed replication of vernacular architecture appearing merely a pastiche; and the need for clear guidelines in order to avoid subjectively in assessing design. The focus should be on policies that put the focus on ensuring all developments enhance local distinctiveness and contribute to a sense of place, that buildings are of a scale and design that respects character and setting and form of the surroundings.
Parking design and standards (Q.29)

Summary of the issue: Should the Council produce parking standards and what principles should underline these?

Summary of responses: Of the responses the overwhelming majority supported the introduction of standards. These should be based on providing enough off-street residential parking to meet actual needs and encourage greener travel modes where practical. Design Guidance should address drainage and the need to protect water Source Protection Zones. There was expressed doubt about whether garage spaces should be counted as part of a minimum parking space provision unless they were of good size and their availability for use could be ensured.

Encouragement of country houses of truly outstanding or innovative design (Q.30)

Summary of the issue: The question addressed in what circumstances a truly outstanding or innovative house design in the countryside might be justified and whether it might help raise the standard of design in South Norfolk.

Summary of responses: There was no support in the responses for encouraging such building in the open countryside. Whereas there was good support for encouraging high quality design and innovation it was generally it was agreed that all development should be on sustainability principles and exemplar buildings should equally be in sustainable locations within settlement boundaries. Several comments referred to the likelihood of this issue being addressed in the NPPF and a significant minority queried how ‘outstanding quality’ could be properly assessed. An expert panel and a voice for the local community were both advocated.

Sustainable communities

Open space and community facilities (Q.31)

Summary of the issue: A question asked for comments on the community facilities and the Councils existing Open Space standards – SNLP Policy LEI7 refers.

Summary of response: The responses addressed a range of issues. In relation to the LEI7 standards a number commented that the standards based on achieving the NPFA standards were out of date – the local standards should address the actual need in the locality rather achievement of a national standard. Several comments referred to the imminent replacement of the PPS 17 national policies by the NPPF and that certain new play space provision will be achieved through CIL funded, JCS green infrastructure strategy.

A number of comments spoke of the value of multi-functional open spaces and Natural England suggested use of their ANGSt national standard for access to accessible natural open space.
The Theatres Trust wanted policies to address the protection of indoor community facilities and theatres.

**Safeguarding local shops and facilities (Q.32)**

**Summary of the issue:** The question explored how the future viability of premises for local shops and other facilities could be fairly assessed when change to another use was proposed?

**Summary of responses:** The responses raised a range of different points. It was generally agreed as important to protect such facilities but difficult to assess potential viability of premises and the actual performances achieved by current management. Several suggested reference to audited accounts from the previous 5 years trading; evidence of marketing; and evidence reviewing the availability and performance of comparable facilities. Other comments focussed on taking a view about future potential by looking at the profile of the changing profile of the local population and the plans for growth.

**Responding to Localism and neighbourhood planning (Q.33)**

**Summary of the issue:** How can development management policies best help explain and set the framework for how Localism will operate in South Norfolk?

**Summary of responses:** The responses made a series of interesting points:

- Several commented that Localism Act was separate legislation and at most any related statements should be restricted to advisory text rather than part of statutory planning policy.
- Several opposing comments point to the need for the Plan to clarify whether ‘precedence’ is to be given to Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDPs) over the Development Management Policies and the Sites Policies DPD, and what is required to show ‘general conformity’ of NDPs with the Core Strategy (Section 8 Sch 10 Localism Act requires)
- The Theatre Trust pointed out that under the Localism Act 2011 Part 5, Chapter 3 Assets of Community Value obligations on the LPA to consult their body under the (GPD)(England) Order 2010 on all applications involving ‘any land on which there is a theatre’ should now extend to the producers of NDPs – a similar principle might now apply to other bodies?
- Guidance should be given to neighbourhoods on how to prepare NDPs
- That higher status should be given to Parish Plans and Village Plans too. For many smaller communities it was simply impractical to produce a NDP but other community led plans have legitimacy and should be adopted as supplementary guidance by the LPA as such.

In terms of improving public engagement references were made to:

- Planners engaging with local communities and establishing a three way dialogue with developers and communities on major proposals
- Feedback – the Council should reflect back to communities how their input has influenced decisions about development
• Simplification of language
• There should be a requirement for developers to meaningfully engage with the community at an early stage.

SECTION 4 - POLICIES FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

Adapting to and mitigating the effects of climate change

Low carbon and renewable energy and the use of water, development in areas at risk of flooding (Qs.34 & 35)

Summary of the issues: The questions sought examples of good practice, any evidence to favour particular types of renewable energy technology, and mitigating factors to take into account in areas of flooding.

Summary of responses: A common response was that the relatively high levels of sunshine and visually open landscape of South Norfolk favoured solar over wind power. Several felt ground source heat pumps were the least intrusive for new development and several favoured communal scale solutions as part of larger new development. Most stressed the need to reduce energy and water use with new homes that will be efficient over the building’s lifetime.

The Broads Authority drew attention to the Broads Landscape Capacity Study for Turbine, PV Arrays and Associated Infrastructure Requirements for Renewable Energy Production’ and stressed the need for the two authorities to consider inter-visibility.

On flooding, the great majority thought there should be no change in current approach and that development should only take place in areas prone to flood in exceptional cases. The Environment Agency and Anglian Water gave detailed responses referring to PPS25 and the impending NPPF, and to Part H of the Building Regulations and National SUDs Standards respectively.

Natural Environment

Non-designated but highly valued open spaces in and around settlements (Q.36)

Summary of the issues: The question explored whether development management policies should do anything to ensure proper consideration of such space.

Summary of responses: A significant minority strongly objected to policies to protect non-designated open spaces and stated that national policy (PPS7 para 24-25) opposed such area based landscape designations. If an area was warranted designation it should be designated.
A number of responses spoke of the intrinsic value of open countryside and its importance to rural communities. The Geographical Society referred to the enhancement of geodiversity by the preserving of small exposures as part of development. Thurton Parish Council commented that SNC and communities should work together to systematically identify important open spaces just as they are with looking for sites for development in the Sites DPD.

Protection of landscape, trees and hedges (Q.37)

Summary of the issues: The question explored whether a separate policy for landscape, trees and hedges was required or whether these matters should be dealt with as part of a general design considerations policy.

Summary of responses: The responses were completely divided with a small majority favouring a separate policy. Those wanting the issues dealt with as part of the general design considerations policy stressed the need to streamline the number of policies and/or felt that this would reinforce the importance of landscape considerations as an integral part of the design process. On the other hand, those wanting a separate policy thought this would help ensure the importance of the issues was recognised and given proper consideration.

Two other distinct points were made by those wanting policies organised differently:
- The Broads Authority favoured addressing landscape considerations on the site and immediate surrounding within a general design considerations policy, and distinctly, the impact of development on the wider landscape in a separate policy. This was particularly important for development in the countryside and also where there was inter-visibility with adjacent districts or the Broads Planning Area.
- The Geological Society of Norfolk consider that landscape should encompass landform (geomorphology). They consider that the preservation of landform is important and best dealt with alongside the rest of geodiversity (and biodiversity) as was indicated in PPS9. Soft landscaping was better dealt with in a separate policy however this is arranged.

Historic Environment

Development impacting on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (Q.38)

Summary of the issue: The question explored how the Council can encourage development of the highest quality that respects local building traditions, and innovative modern design that respects local character and heritage?

Summary of response: All of the responses agreed it was important to get these matters right; a number pointed to the need to respect local design features and that engagement with local communities, architects and builders would help. The important role of the Place Making Guide was mentioned by several.
English Heritage note that the draft NPPF refers to the historic environment among topics to be addressed in local plan strategic policies. They consider the JCS coverage is limited and recommend that the DM policies include strategic policy in this area. They support the DM policy as proposed but consider it should link to a strategy for the historic environment; this should include policies for addressing and the monitoring of heritage assets at risk.

Norfolk County Council supported the suggested policy and suggested additions. They consider that archaeology should be fully addressed and the potential for previously unknown or unrecorded heritage assets should be investigated on sites of over 1ha. Also, that certain types of business premises have historic and archaeological significance as heritage assets and evidence of their significance and the impact of development upon this should be required.

SECTION 5 – ANYTHING ELSE?

Important parts of the soon to be deleted national planning policies and guidance, that the Council should reproduce? (Q.39)

Summary of the issue: Important parts of the soon to be deleted national planning policies and guidance, that the Council should reproduce?

Summary of responses: Several respondents warned that the spirit of Government policy was to streamline the planning system and that it would be contrary to include additional guidance purely because it had been deleted at national level.

Several pointed out that it will be necessary to await the publication of the NPPF in final form to allow proper a review, and one respondent suggested an extension of the consultation period by 4 weeks to allow this. A range of aspects were considered important to carry forward by various respondents:

- The importance of supporting the rural economy
- That local plan policies should include reference to the higher level NPPF policies relied upon to make it easier for the reader to understand the whole range of relevant planning policies
- The Mobile Operators Association consider it necessary to include a positive generic criteria based policy for telecommunications equipment to replace PPG8. A draft policy is proposed.
- The Environment Agency pointed to the lack on guidance in the draft NPPF on water quality, the requirements of the Water Framework Directive and Contaminated Land
Is there anything else you want to say? (Q.40)

Summary of the issue: The consultation document and questions had focussed on some key issues identified by the Council but was not intended to address everything that might be included in the policies, was there anything else really important respondents wished to say?

Summary of responses: A wide variety of points can be summarised thus:

- The importance of keeping the identity of towns and villages intact
- Maintaining rural character of the district
- Importance of resisting all night outdoor lighting and street lighting in rural villages
- The Sustainability Framework Objectives (SFO) (Appendix A of the consultation document) should be developed with guidance and examples of how these might be achieved
- Add further SFO ENV 10 to ensure that all new build and existing sewage and surface water schemes are coordinated
- Add further SFO ENV11 to ensure communities achieve 2.00ha natural space per 1000 residents
- The design principles policy should include reference to water efficiency and JCS Policy 3
- The importance of rural local needs housing
- In relation to new shopping and town centre uses – the Council should allocate sufficient sites based on up-to-date evidence of economic development and retail capacity and need, and assessment of the capacity of town centre sites for new floorspace. Any locally adopted thresholds for requiring a sequential site assessment should be proportionate to the scale of the towns affected, the catchment of the development proposal. It is important that the LPA and developers engage at pre-application stage to agree the basis of retail impact assessments and sequential site assessments
- That the Duty to Cooperate presents further opportunity to cooperate in the operation of planning documents and further the work done with the GNDP
- The districts have a Duty to Cooperate with the Norfolk County Council. In particular in relation to transport, infrastructure delivery, SUDs and adult social care
- There should be cross references to CIL through the GNDP and to other planning obligations for matters such as on-site infrastructure, land transfer, highways and on-site infrastructure
- There needs to be facility for considering cross boarder impacts for the parishes that boarder another district, and one parish on another
- The Broads Authority would like to see more prominence given to the Broads Planning Area, including criteria for development proposals in the vicinity of the Broads with particular reference to landscape impacts, flood and water quality risks, development in the open countryside, and the interdependence of the Broads and South Norfolk planning areas in terms of community identity, facilities, and recreational and economic value. The Policies should make clear that they do not apply in those parts of South Norfolk District in the designated Broads area.
- Density should be reduced
• Neighbourhood Boards should be consulted
• Brownfield sites should be developed in preference to Greenfield
• The importance of the overarching definition of sustainability is key
• No more Homezones – dangerous
• The policies should give more consideration of Surface Water flooding and the management of surface water
• Localism is about reflecting the need of the people at a local level and ensuring that decisions and power comes from that level – need to show more recognition of the need for and use of the evidence of consultation, to demonstrate that this is actually what is being provided for
• Parish Council views must be given weight and when not concurred with, the PC must be advised why. There should be facility for PC to appeal decisions where permission is granted against their views
• There should be discussion about the future consultation arrangements and roles between the parishes and district councils
• Use of plain English and simplify planning
• Support existing businesses located in the countryside – these can make a significant contribution to the rural economy.
Annex 1

Development Management Policies
Notes from the Planning Agents discussion session – 7th February 2012

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Brown</td>
<td>Croudace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Campbell</td>
<td>Savills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Chapman</td>
<td>T W Gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Conway</td>
<td>Gable Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Gates</td>
<td>Plandescil Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Haslam</td>
<td>Michael Haslam Assoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Kemp</td>
<td>Gable Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Knowles</td>
<td>Building Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel Lockwood</td>
<td>Bidwells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Richardson</td>
<td>Arnolds Property Consultants Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Smith</td>
<td>Hopkins Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Watson</td>
<td>BDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Western</td>
<td>Lucas Hickman Smith Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Wheatman</td>
<td>Wheatman Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Williams</td>
<td>DPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Wright</td>
<td>TW Gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Roberts</td>
<td>Roberts Malloy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Irvine</td>
<td>Allan Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Durrant</td>
<td>Durrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Whithan</td>
<td>South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Horspole</td>
<td>South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Thornton</td>
<td>For South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda items

After a welcome by TH and introductions around the table, MT gave a presentation on the Development Management Policies and led into discussion around some of the issues addressed in the Summary Questionnaire.

2. Some key issues – discussion around the questions in the ‘issues and options’ documents

Q.1 What make development sustainable?
- Generally acceptance of the suggestion that the Sustainability Appraisal should be the starting point for determining what is sustainable development. Should look to the SA framework indicators to identify what is sustainable.
- General feeling that location was the key factor in achieving sustainable development.

Q.6 Increased flexibility for commercial uses?
- The whole group was supportive of more flexibility. Planning aspirations should be realistic about market forces. However there should be with ‘sensible’ limits to the flexibility.
- Generally agreed that the key issue is whether the new uses will support the particular business area, therefore the appropriate uses will vary on a case by case basis. May need to be more restrictive at locations where seeking to create a particular type of business characteristic. e.g. More restrictive at the NRC?
- Agreement that the mix of business / industrial uses at an employment locations can be problematic too – e.g. the location of a proposed waste incinerator at Eye conflicts with aspirations for smart BI uses at the frontage.
- Similarly, must recognise that a range of different type and ‘quality’ of business areas are needed to cater for all the necessary types of business and each will be differ in character / market values etc.
- Several comments that industrial estate locations are often attractive to shops and services simply because they are accessible and cheap (an example of £8sq.ft vs £48sq.ft quoted) for comparison of some estate and some town centre locations. Reference made to estates outside of Diss compared to the town centre.
- The Council’s concern to avoid open retailing moving onto convenient out-of-town employment locations were generally recognised and accepted, however no one disagreed with one comment that in this part of the country a bigger threat to town centres appears be the impact of internet shopping.
Q13 – reuse of redundant farm buildings?

- A suggestion that we introduce a default starting point that employment use is always acceptable in redundant rural buildings was supported by many. It was then the case for an exception to be demonstrated.
- Generally agreed that current Policy needs to change. General agreement with one comment made that the requirement for long periods of marketing and other detailed evidence is a waste of everybody’s time – and that a simple commercial viability ‘formula’ will show whether the costs of conversion for an industrial rent return will ever be viable. Basic rural industrial values quoted at £2-4sq.ft.
- The requirements of the funding and finance institutions should be better understood and that these underpinned everything. One comment that many farmers don’t seem to understand this either met some agreement. They can make irrational decisions leading to both unviable investments and refusal to raise capital for a development – missing out on good opportunities.
- Waveney’s Policy referred to by one as being far worse!
- Policy expectations of achieving ‘rustic craft workshops’ and high quality offices in heritage quality rural conversions are likely to be unrealistic. High costs of conversion will be unaffordable for crafts and there will be no demand to travel to a remote locations for an office space necessarily at some £8/sq.ft.
- Conversion of outbuildings for business uses where the owner lives on elsewhere site can be viable and should be allowed. Sustainable pattern of development. Agreement that this may require allowing some retail use as a ‘shop window’ to the business - even if the business principally it relies on internet sales and/or delivery services. e.g. Furniture making.

Q22-23 – residential standards?

- Generally comments were very much against the introduction of minimum internal space standards. Considered that this will: deter house building by increasing costs, reducing land values and therefore reducing the supply of sites coming to market.
- Comment that external standards will lead to formulaic design.
- RSLs have minimum space and performance standards – for the benefit of occupiers who have no choice in the market. The Policy will apply to market housing only. Some comments that LPA should not attempt to intervene in the open market - it should be left to buyers to choose what size property they buy. Comments that ‘it’s a buyers market’ and they won’t buy something they don’t want.
- Comment that we have the code for sustainable homes and parts for buildings regulations to give some uniform standards.
- One comment that if we have minimum sizes – who is going to check all the sizes? What will the LPA do if a unit is only a couple of sq.m. under the minimum? On the other hand, it was noted that applicants we will need to give precise dimensions for CIL purposes.
NB. Outside of the meeting, several attendees expressed support for some minimum standards

Q.25 – single storey housing?

- General agreement to one comment that a requirement to include bungalows in schemes will lead to less efficient use of land and will be less sustainable on some criteria (as will a requirement to increase the size of houses with minimum space standards). More Greenfield land will be required! It was asked if Members really appreciated this?
- One comment that we would need to remove PD to maintain the stock of bungalows in perpetuity, others felt this would be unjustifiable.
- Some questioning of what evidence there is to say there is a need for single storey homes in SNC?
- However, also a number of comments that in fact bungalows are popular and sell well so there is commercial interest in some provision. Appeared to be some sympathy for Members preference for bungalows over Lifetime Homes standards.
- One comment that integrating single storey buildings into a scheme design could be problematic.

Q.19 - five year housing supply?

- Generally felt that a Policy was not necessary – SNC have a short-term problem; should ‘get on with it’ and allocate adequate land quickly.
- Also a general view that this is really a political not a technical problem – a reluctance to allocate more sites than absolutely necessary.
- One comment met with wide agreement – that SNC should allocate more sites, perhaps aiming for a 10 year supply of available sites so that this problem doesn’t reoccur. These could be phased, if a first phase site doesn’t perform then relegate to a later phase or delete it altogether and bring forward another.
- Another suggestion was to establish a ‘strategic reserve’ of sites as a contingency.


- There was interest in further discussion and also in the use of social networking media for ‘virtual’ discussion. This may not be successful but it is worth a try.
4. **Interest in re-establishing the Planning User Panel (or similar) for a targets set of tasks and timescale?**

- Generally agreed that this was a good idea. Probably with less people than here present.
- General support for a suggestion that a small number of key Members attend in order to help them understand the market perspective and to discuss issues.
- Officers undertook to take this suggestion to the Leadership.
Appendix C

Extract - draft minutes of Scrutiny Committee 15th May 2012

1040 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICY DOCUMENT

The Planning Policy Manager introduced the report and reminded members of progress made so far. Members’ attention was drawn to the list of draft policies within the report, and were asked for their thoughts and comments on these. Members were informed that the next stage would be to present the draft policies to the Cabinet in June 2012.

The Chief Executive reminded members of the importance of clear, precise policies to ensure future consistency in decision making. This point was also made by the Planning Policy Manager who reinforced the need for certainty in the Council’s future policies. This would help both developers and the Council at application stage, but would also benefit the Council when decisions were appealed.

Members went through the table of topics and policies proposed and commented on areas of concern.

- There was some discussion as to whether there was a need for a specific policy for those wishing to make changes to a dwelling to enable working from home, or whether this could be covered under a more general, generic policy. Concern was expressed that a specific policy could actually deter people from working at home, while other members felt that such a policy would demonstrate that the Council wanted to encourage starting up a business from home. The general consensus reached by members was that such a policy would be desirable to demonstrate that the Council encouraged and promoted working from home.

- Members discussed the proposed policy for consideration of proposals for ‘main town centre uses’ which could not be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres. It was generally considered that such a policy should be included.

- Members were in agreement that the proposed policy relating to dwellings in the countryside necessary for rural enterprises should be included in the document.

- The issue of housing quality and design guidelines and standards was briefly discussed with members confirming that such a policy should be included.
• The housing needs topic area was discussed, specifically with regard to the provision of a mix of housing to meet housing need. Members stressed the importance of ensuring that the next housing needs assessment should include information regarding the possible need for single storey dwellings.

• Members were in agreement that a policy regarding Gypsies and Travellers was desirable to add a local dimension to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) position.

• After discussion members concluded that policies for extensions/conversions etc of dwellings both within settlement boundaries and in the open countryside should be included in the document. Members felt it was necessary for such applications to be more impact assessed, and for more consideration to be given to the size of the application site.

• Members considered it would be appropriate to have a policy to control advertisements, signs and shop fronts.

• With regard to the provision of telecommunications networks and equipment, members were satisfied that the NPPF was clear on these issues, and that a Development Management Policy would not be necessary.

• Members considered it necessary to include a policy to deal with surface water drainage for certain areas of the District.

• Members were in agreement that a policy regarding assessment of the impact of development proposals on the wider landscape should be included in the document. Members were particularly concerned with the issue of maintenance of strategic gaps where appropriate.

RESOLVED To endorse the Table subject to the comments above, and to recommend it to the Cabinet.
The Council is preparing an Area Action Plan (AAP) for Wymondham to bring forward the growth identified in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The AAP is an opportunity to plan for housing, jobs, services, infrastructure and community benefits in Wymondham in a co-ordinated way. The Council consulted on the first stage of preparing the AAP between 23 January and 16 March 2012. The aim of this stage of consultation was to gather people’s views about future development in Wymondham. The results of the consultation have now been used to develop a Vision and Objectives for the AAP. Cabinet is recommended to approve the attached Vision and Objectives and to instruct officers to proceed with production of a more detailed Preferred Options document for public consultation in autumn 2012.

Cabinet member(s):
John Fuller

Ward(s) affected:
Abbey, Cromwells, Northfields, Rustens and Town

Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail:
Carole Baker 01508 533807
cbaker@s-norfolk.gov.uk

1. Background

1.1. Area Action Plans (AAPs) provide the planning framework for areas where significant change or conservation is needed. The aim of an AAP is to deliver planned growth areas, stimulate regeneration, protect areas sensitive to change, resolve conflicting objectives in areas subject to development pressure or focus on the delivery of area based regeneration initiatives.

1.2. The Council has highlighted the need for AAPs for Wymondham and Long Stratton where the scale and/or nature of proposed development requires more detailed guidance than can be achieved through a site allocation. Once adopted the AAPs will form part of the Council’s Local Plan and will be used by members when making planning decisions.

1.3. The Council is preparing an AAP for Wymondham to identify sites for future development and co-ordinate infrastructure provision in line with the strategic
policies in the Council’s Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which was formally adopted in March 2011. Wymondham is identified in the JCS as a sustainable location for major growth and it has the highest level of development proposed in any of the named growth locations in South Norfolk.

1.4. The JCS identifies Wymondham for growth of at least 2,200 dwellings, up to 20 hectares of employment land and improved services and facilities including expansion of the town centre, enhanced public transport and new education provision. The JCS also refers to maintaining the strategic gap to the north and north west of the town, protecting the historic setting of the town and abbey and providing extensive levels of green infrastructure to create a ‘Ketts Country’ pastoral landscape.

2. **Current Position and Issues**

2.1. South Norfolk Council consulted on the first stage of preparing the Wymondham Area Action Plan between 23 January and 16 March 2012. The aim of this stage of consultation was to gather people’s views about future development in Wymondham. A leaflet and survey entitled ‘Wymondham 2026 – Shaping the future development of your town’ were prepared in conjunction with Wymondham Town Council and sent to all homes and businesses in the Parish of Wymondham, including Spooner Row and Suton.

2.2. There was a good response to the survey. We sent out 7162 surveys and 1043 were completed, a response rate of 14%. The report of the results of the consultation is attached at appendix 1.

2.3. Detailed analysis of the ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey has shown a great degree of similarity between answers from the 2007 Community Survey previously carried out by the Wymondham Community Partnership and questionnaires completed at Wymondham High schools. This demonstrates that there is a strong feeling about particular issues in the town and that the same issues are relevant now that were relevant 5 years ago.

2.4. The key messages emerging from the ‘Wymondham 2026’ consultation are listed in the report at appendix 1 and are:
- Preserve unique market town identity
- Preserve historical character of town
- Preserve natural environment
- Provide local employment opportunities
- A number of smaller developments favoured over large developments
- Important to improve medical/health facilities, schools and education and surface water and sewerage when providing new developments
- Greater choice of shops and services in town centre
- Support for a new supermarket
- Support for start up units for new businesses
- Maintain gap between Wymondham and Hethersett
- Need for more publically accessible open space

2.5. The Council has already asked broad questions about the potential content of the AAPs as part of the consultation process into the Site Specific Policies and
Allocations document. We also asked for comments about individual site suggestions. The first public consultation into this document took place between 1 September and 19 November 2010 and a second consultation took place between 29 August and 18 November 2011. Responses to these consultations will feed into the process of preparing the AAP.

3. Proposal and Reasons

3.1. The results from the ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey (appendix 1) together with the requirements listed in the JCS have been used to write a Vision and set of Objectives for the Wymondham AAP (attached at appendix 2).

3.2. The proposed Vision and Objectives are as follows:

**Vision**

‘Wymondham - a forward looking market town which embraces sustainable growth to enhance its unique identity and sense of community, whilst ensuring that its historic character and natural environment are preserved for future generations to enjoy’

**Objectives**

**Housing:**

‘2,200 new houses will be built on a number of sites around the town meeting the highest standards of design, energy efficiency and affordability whilst recognising the need to sustain and improve the distinctive character of Wymondham and provide the necessary infrastructure and public open space to support new development’

**Employment:**

‘20 hectares of land will be developed for a range of employment uses to support local employment opportunities and economic growth in and around Wymondham, building on the historically strong take-up of employment land in the town and Wymondham’s prominent position on the A11 Corridor. To improve links with and accessibility to strategic employment growth at Hethel technology park’

**Environment:**

‘A ‘Ketts Country’ pastoral landscape of grass, wood, hedgerow and wetland habitat will be created to strengthen the role of the Tiffey valley and maintain the open land between Wymondham and Hethersett with the aim of protecting and enhancing the historic landscape setting of the town and abbey’

**Recreation:**

‘The health, well being and quality of life of local residents will be improved and the unique character and sense of community that already exists within the town will be maintained and enhanced by protecting existing public open space in the town from development and providing additional public open space to support new development’
Town Centre:
‘Wymondham town centre will be improved and expanded to give a greater choice of shops and services whilst retaining and enhancing its distinct historic core and its role as a vibrant market town’

Accessibility:
‘The use of public transport (both bus and rail) will be maximised and safe and direct pedestrian and cycle routes will be provided to link key locations in and around Wymondham and to enhance longer distance access to Hethersett, the Norwich Research Park and employment expansion at Hethel’

3.3. Once agreed the Vision and Objectives, together with the representations received to earlier consultations and a detailed assessment of all the individual sites suggested will be used to produce a more detailed Preferred Options document for public consultation. The document will present the Council’s Preferred Options and any reasonable alternatives for public comment and consultation is planned to take place in autumn 2012. The Preferred Options document will need to be agreed at a future Cabinet meeting.

3.4. It will be important to look at the growth of Wymondham in a co-ordinated way and not just concentrate on individual allocated sites. The AAP is not just about housing growth, it will also consider issues such as how to deliver jobs, services, infrastructure and wider community benefits in a co-ordinated and joined up matter.

4. Other Options

4.1. South Norfolk Council has committed to undertake an AAP for Wymondham both in the Local Development Scheme and, more recently, as part of the Site Specific Policies and Allocations consultation.

4.2. It is important to progress the AAP quickly because at the moment there is development pressure on land around the town. There have been several speculative planning applications for housing and a number of sites in the frame as potential locations for a new supermarket in recent months. The results of the consultation give us a clear vision of what local people want and will help us to plan properly for the future of Wymondham, rather than the piecemeal development that is currently taking place.

4.3. The other option for the Council is not to prepare an AAP for Wymondham. This could result in development being undertaken in an uncoordinated way.

5. Relevant Corporate Priorities

5.1. Enhancing our quality of life and the environment we live in. The AAP process will help to identify land that will be developed for new homes, including affordable housing. The AAP process includes Sustainability Assessment which will cover environmental, social and economic factors.
5.2. Promoting a thriving local economy. The JCS proposes 20 hectares of land be identified and developed for employment.

5.3. Supporting communities to realise their potential. The AAP process offers residents the opportunity to shape future development and help establish infrastructure requirements.

6. Implications and Risks

6.1. Financial – The cost of undertaking large-scale consultation, including analysing and answering responses is included in existing budgets.

6.2. Environmental – The AAP offers opportunities to maximise the local and wider environmental gains from development in Wymondham.

6.3. Equalities – The AAP process encourages wide involvement across the local community, to be monitored as part of the consultation process.

6.4. Risks – Delays in the production of the AAP sees development proceed in an uncoordinated manner.

7. Conclusion

7.1. The Council is committed to producing an AAP for Wymondham. As work on the Site Specific Policies and Allocations document is progressing it is important to continue work on the Wymondham AAP so that the growth in the town can be planned in a coordinated way.

8. Recommendations

8.1. Cabinet is recommended to approve the attached Vision and Objectives (appendix 2) and to instruct officers to proceed with production of a Preferred Options document for public consultation in autumn 2012. The Preferred Options document will need to be agreed at a future Cabinet meeting.

Appendix 1
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Wymondham Area Action Plan – Vision and Objectives
Wymondham Area Action Plan

Report of initial public consultation

23 January – 16 March 2012

Introduction

Area Action Plans (AAPs) provide the planning framework for areas where significant change or conservation is needed. The aim of an AAP is to deliver planned growth areas, stimulate regeneration, protect areas sensitive to change, resolve conflicting objectives in areas subject to development pressure or focus on the delivery of area based regeneration initiatives.

The Council is preparing an AAP for Wymondham to identify sites for future development and co-ordinate infrastructure provision in line with the strategic policies in the Council’s adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS). Wymondham is identified in the JCS as a sustainable location for major growth and it has the highest level of development proposed in any of the named growth locations in South Norfolk.

The JCS identifies Wymondham for growth of at least 2,200 dwellings, up to 20 hectares of employment land and improved services and facilities including expansion of the town centre, enhanced public transport and new education provision. The JCS also refers to maintaining the strategic gap to the north and north west of the town, protecting the historic setting of the town and abbey and providing extensive levels of green infrastructure to create a ‘Ketts Country’ pastoral landscape.

South Norfolk Council consulted on the first stage of preparing the Wymondham Area Action Plan between 23 January and 16 March 2012. The aim of this stage of consultation was to gather people’s views about future development in Wymondham. This report outlines the process of public consultation and highlights the main findings.

Public consultation launch

The consultation was launched at a public meeting on Friday 20 January held at Ketts Park Community Centre and chaired by George Freeman MP. The meeting was well attended by at least 300 people and was preceded by an exhibition staffed by officers from the Council. The meeting gave local people an opportunity to raise issues concerning them about where they live and topics discussed included; housing growth, supermarket and retail provision and the need for services and infrastructure to be improved (minutes of the meeting attached at Appendix 1 – to follow).
Wymondham 2026 leaflet and survey - ‘Shaping the future development of your town’

A leaflet and survey entitled ‘Wymondham 2026: Shaping the future development of your town’ were prepared in conjunction with Wymondham Town Council and were sent out to all homes and businesses in Wymondham Parish, including Spooner Row and Suton.

We used the Wymondham and Attleborough Mercury (where delivered) to distribute the majority of surveys (5423) and directly posted to the remainder of addresses (1739). We also wrote to a large number of other consultees including agents and developers, government organisations, neighbouring local authorities, local schools, environment, heritage and amenity groups and transport and utility bodies. In addition we wrote to neighbouring parish councils and asked them to publicise the consultation to their local residents by displaying posters. People could complete the survey online, post it back to us or drop it into the Wymondham Town Council offices.

During the consultation period we held three exhibitions at different locations in Wymondham (Town Council offices, Wymondham Leisure Centre and Wymondham Library). The exhibition was in situ at each location for a week and staffed by Council officers for a 4 hour period at each location – one morning, one afternoon and one evening so that the widest number of people were able to attend. Attendance at the exhibitions was disappointing (4 at the Town Council offices, 10 at the Leisure Centre and 20 at the Library), however this is likely to be because the public meeting on 20 January was so well attended and many people had the opportunity to talk directly to a planning officer then.

We had a good response rate to the survey. 1043 surveys were complete, 300 directly online, the remaining 700 on paper which had to be input by Council staff. This represents a 14% response rate. Nearly half of the paper surveys (300) were left in a sealed ballot box at the Wymondham Town Council offices. An additional 21 responses were received from developers/ other bodies (which are summarised at Appendix 2). These are reflected in the detailed analysis section below where appropriate and some of the more detailed and specific comments will be considered at the preferred options stage.

Wymondham Town Council undertook a Community Survey in 2007, working together with Wymondham Community Partnership, South Norfolk Council, the Business Forum and a number of community organisations. This survey resulted in the publication of a document called ‘Wymondham’s Future – Strategic Plan 2008-2013’. This 2007 survey was used as a starting point when developing the Wymondham AAP questionnaire. Some of the questions in the ‘Wymondham 2026’ questionnaire are similar to those asked in the 2007 Town Council survey so that the responses can be compared and this is reflected in the detailed analysis section below.
Schools Consultation

Council officers visited both Wymondham College and Wymondham High School as part of the consultation process to run a planning exercise with the students. We visited Wymondham College on two occasions in June 2011 and February 2012 and Wymondham High School in November 2011. We ran an exercise asking the students to explore constraints to development and then asked them to plan and map for the requirements of the JCS, using sites suggested for the LDF. Finally we showed them the representations received to 2 public consultations on sites and asked them whether it influenced the decisions they had made. At the end of the June 2011 and November 2011 sessions we gave the students a shortened version of the survey to complete. There were 99 completed questionnaires and the results are reflected in the detailed analysis section below. We did not have time for the students to complete the survey at the February 2012 session but as this was during the actual consultation period we gave out a copy of the survey and encouraged the students to complete online.

Planning Workshop

We ran a planning workshop in the Tiffey Room at Central Hall on Saturday 3 March for invited guests from Wymondham, including Town Councillors and representatives from interest groups within the Town, such as Vision our Wymondham, Wymondham Asks Why, Lizard Residents Association, Friends of the Tiffey and Governors from Wymondham High School. We ran a similar exercise to the one we did with schools, asking attendees to think about constraints to development in Wymondham then look at where they would put the development requirements of the JCS, using the map of sites suggested and responses received to public consultations to assist them. Evaluation sheets were completed following the workshop which showed that the session was well received and there was remarkable similarity in what the groups came up with. It is planned to run a further workshop session later in the process to assist with developing the Preferred Options document.

Previous Public Consultations

The Council has already asked broad questions about the content of the AAP as part of the consultation process into the ‘Site Specific Policies and Allocations’ document, this included asking for comments about individual sites suggestions. The first public consultation into the ‘Site Specific Policies and Allocations’ document took place between 1 September and 19 November 2010 and a second consultation took place between 29 August and 18 November 2011 and responses made to these consultations will feed into the AAP preparation process at Preferred Options stage.
Detailed Analysis of Responses to the Survey

Question 1
Where do you live?

Of the 1043 respondents the largest number (38%) were from the North Wymondham area, with a significant percentage (24%) from Wymondham town centre. Of the 10% of respondents that lived in ‘other locations’ this included 41 who specified a particular Wymondham address rather than choosing one of the options given, and 27 from neighbouring villages.

Question 2
Do you work in Wymondham?

1028 of the 1043 respondents answered this question and 25% of them worked in Wymondham.
Question 3
How important are the following things about Wymondham now?

How important are the following things about Wymondham now?

1020 respondents answered this question.

The top 3 results in the 'very important' category were:
1. Historic market town (768 responses)
2. The natural environment (713 responses)
3. Quality of local schools (690 responses)

The top 3 results in the 'important' category were:
1. Local employment opportunities (463 responses)
2. Availability of housing (458 responses)
3. Good community spirit (412 responses)

When the results for the ‘very important’ and ‘important’ categories are combined the top 3 results are:
1. The natural environment (960 responses)
2. Historic market town (956 responses)
3. Range of services and facilities (949 responses)

The top 3 results in the 'not important' category were:
1. Availability of housing (290 responses)
2. Close to Norwich (282 responses)
3. Local employment opportunities (120 responses)

Of those that answered ‘Other’, the most popular answers were:
- Green spaces and agricultural land
- Wymondham’s unique market town identity
Comparison with ‘Wymondham’s Future – Strategic Plan 2008-2013’
Wymondham’s character as a historic market town was the most important thing (29% of responses).
The green environment, good community spirit and closeness to Norwich were also considered important.

Question 4
What type of place do you think Wymondham should be in 2026?

1019 respondents answered this question.

The top 3 answers were:
1. An historic market town whose character is recognised and protected (89%)
2. A market town with a good range of shops and services (85%)
3. A residential town with local employment opportunities (58%)

Encouragely only 7.6% of respondents chose the ‘no change’ option.

Under the ‘Other’ option there was a wide variety of different answers, which included:
- A town with an unique historic character
- A town with better facilities
- A town where the natural environment and green spaces are protected

Comparison with ‘Wymondham’s Future – Strategic Plan 2008-2013’
A historic market town with a protected centre was favoured by 75% of people.
Question 5
What type of housing development would you support in Wymondham to accommodate at least 2,200 new homes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All housing together in one large planned development</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A couple of larger developments</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A number of smaller developments around the town</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

941 respondents answered this question. Of these a clear majority (71%) supported a number of smaller developments around the town.

**Comparison with ‘Wymondham’s Future – Strategic Plan 2008-2013’**
57% of respondents would prefer a series of small scale developments and were largely opposed to big developments.

**Comparison with results of Wymondham Schools questionnaires**
Clear support (41%) for a series of smaller developments around town
Question 6
Where would you prefer to see new housing development located?

1005 respondents answered this question. The majority of respondents (56%) would prefer housing development to be located on a combination of smaller sites around the town. In terms of locations South Wymondham was favoured with North Wymondham being the least popular option.

Of the 14% of respondents that answered ‘Other’ the largest proportion did not want to see any further development in Wymondham, with a number of people suggesting alternative locations both within and outside Wymondham.

Comparison with results of Wymondham Schools questionnaires
Strong support (40%) for a combination of smaller sites around the town. Evenly split between North Wymondham and South Wymondham as locations for development with less support for growth in West Wymondham.
A comparison was made between the answers of where people lived against where they would like to see housing development located. No matter where people lived the majority favoured small developments around the town. Predictably those living in North Wymondham favoured development in South and West Wymondham and those living in South Wymondham favoured development in West and North Wymondham.

**Question 7**
When building new houses in Wymondham, how important is it for the following things to be improved?
1020 respondents answered this question.

The top 3 results in the ‘very important’ category were:
1. Medical and health services (758 responses)
2. Schools and education facilities (731 responses)
3. Surface water and sewerage (647 responses)

The top 3 results in the ‘important’ category were:
1. Sports facilities (488 responses)
2. Play areas (464 responses)
3. Employment opportunities (462 responses)

When the results for the ‘very important’ and ‘important’ categories are combined the top 3 results are:
1. Medical and health services (947 responses)
2. Schools and education facilities (935 responses)
3. Surface water and sewerage (907 responses)

The top 3 results in the ‘not important’ category were:
1. Art and cultural facilities (278 responses)
2. Sports facilities (207 responses)
3. Affordable housing (187 responses)

**Comparison with ‘Wymondham’s Future – Strategic Plan 2008-2013’**
Top results were:
- Medical/health services
- Education facilities
- Surface water and sewerage
- Town centre and retail services

**Environment Agency response to survey:**
Development within Wymondham should take account of the environmental constraints/opportunities of the area. For example, flood risk and surface water drainage, land contamination, groundwater vulnerability, the capacity of the foul water infrastructure (waste water treatment works and foul sewer network), ecology and impacts upon environmentally designated sites, proximity to a watercourse and green and blue infrastructure.

AAP should include a policy/guidance on the issue of surface water management. Consideration should be given to the SuDS management train in order to enhance water quality and amenity value, at the same time as promoting a reduction in flood risk.
Theatres Trust response to survey:
The leaflet gives details of all the serious elements of the town that will require upgrading or the provision of new, but it doesn’t mention the social infrastructure that is so important for residents quality of life and a vibrant evening economy. Physical activity and social and intellectual stimulation are vital ingredients for a healthy lifestyle. This requires people to have access to facilities such as libraries, museums, performance spaces, play sport and enjoy walking in open spaces.

Question 8
Do you/or your family use Wymondham as your main location for:

1007 respondents answered this question. Of these the top 3 answers were:
- Healthcare (e.g. doctors, dentist, pharmacy) (95%)
- Services (e.g. banking, hairdresser, solicitor) (89%)
- Day to day shopping (e.g. food and household items) (74%)
988 respondents answered this question. A clear majority (74%) wanted to see a greater choice of shops and services in the town centre.

Of the 24% who answered ‘Other’, a variety of answers were suggested the main one being the choice and types of shops in the town centre. Other answers included no change/protection of existing town centre, free parking and maintenance of green spaces in the town centre.
1001 respondents answered this question and the clear majority (72%) said yes, Wymondham did need a new supermarket.

The question also asked where the best place was for a new supermarket to be located. This question was deliberately open ended as it was important not to influence peoples answers. The responses to this question indicated broad support for an out of town location over a town centre supermarket and support for the use of a brownfield site over greenfield. In terms of location the greatest public support was for the old Saleground site near the railway station, followed by re-use of the empty Focus store, then the Semmence site. There was some limited public support for Kings Head Meadow but this was outweighed by the number of people who said it should not be located on Kings Head Meadow.
Question 11
What sort of employment opportunities are needed in Wymondham?

926 respondents answered this question. There was clear support (68%) for start up units for small businesses. There was least support (26%) for new industrial estates.

Of the 12% who answered ‘Other’, a wide variety of different answers were given, including using empty units first, using existing units in a better way and the need to provide jobs for local people.

Question 12
Where should up to 20 hectares (50 acres) of new employment land be located in Wymondham?
982 respondents answered this question. There was fairly even support for all the locations suggested, although there was more limited support for including new employment land as part of large developments.

Of the 9% who answered ‘Other’, a wide variety of different answers were given. Some respondents did not see the need for any more employment land in Wymondham, whilst others thought existing empty units should be utilised first. In terms of locations there was some support for the area around Browick Road.

**Comparison with results of Wymondham Schools questionnaires**

Fairly even support for extensions to existing employment areas at Gateway 11 and London Road. Less support for a site further out of Wymondham along the B1172 at Spooner Row/Suton or for having employment areas as part of any large development.

A comparison was made between the answers of where people lived against where they would like to see employment development located. Predictably those living in North Wymondham and on Harts Farm favoured an extension of London Road or further out along the B1172 at Suton over Gateway 11.
Question 13  
What would encourage you to walk and cycle more for local journeys?

892 respondents answered this question. There was clear support (65%) for safer routes e.g. separate from traffic.

Of the 23% who answered ‘Other’ many stated that they already do walk/cycle where possible with others stating that nothing would encourage them or they weren’t able to walk or cycle more. Other answers included the need for better foot and cycle ways and concerns regarding traffic and parking.

Question 14a  
Do you regularly use public transport (e.g. bus/rail) to travel to and from Wymondham?

987 respondents answered this question. There was a fairly even 50/50 split between those who did and did not use the bus with a more distinct split with regard to train travel. The majority of respondents did not use the train service to and from Wymondham.
Question 14b
If yes, how do you rate the service?

578 respondents answered this question. Overall the majority of respondents rated both the bus and train service as good.

Question 14c
Please tell us how you would like to see the service improve?

This was a free text question answered by 441 people. This question was difficult to analyse because there was a wide variety of different issues raised. The top 3 answers were:

1. Bus timetabling/frequency of services, including better spacing between First and Konnect services, more late night buses and evening services to and from Norwich, an earlier journey to work service, more reliable services and better timetable information.

2. Train timetabling/frequency of services, including the need for more trains to stop at Wymondham (particularly long distance trains on the Midlands line), a direct service to London, later evening trains, improved connection times with other services (both bus and rail) and a more frequent service between Norwich and Cambridge.

3. Bus routing, including more direct services to Norwich (not via Hethersett), more direct services to other places e.g. Attleborough, Dereham and the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, bus links to the railway station, more frequent bus services to outlying villages and suburbs and concern about the routing of long distance coach services through the town.

Other issues raised included the rising cost of public transport, the need for more bus shelters, better cleanliness on buses, the need for more train carriages at peak times and the need to address disabled access onto the south platform at the train station.
Question 15
Can you think of any changes which could improve highway safety and traffic circulation around Wymondham?

This was a free text question answered by 440 people. The top answers were:
- Parking issues around the town
- Traffic circulation in the town centre
- Change in or better enforcement of speed limits
- Separate cycle routes
- Pedestrianisation of the town centre

Question 16
Do you agree that an area of open and undeveloped land should be maintained between Wymondham and Hethersett to stop the two places merging together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question was answered by 961 respondents. A clear majority (89%) supported the idea that an area of open and undeveloped land should be maintained between Wymondham and Hethersett to stop the two places merging together.

765 respondents took the opportunity to tell us why this should be the case. The main reason given was that both places should maintain their separate identities.

Comparison with results of Wymondham Schools questionnaires
Overwhelming support (90%) for retaining a gap between Wymondham and Hethersett. Main reason given was to maintain two distinct communities with their own identities.
Question 17
Please tell us about any important spaces of views in and around Wymondham that you think should be protected?

882 respondents answered this question. This was asked as a deliberately open-ended question so as not to influence people's answers. The top 5 answers given were:
- Tiffey Valley
- Kings Head Meadow
- The Lizard
- The area around the Abbey
- Views from Chapel Lane

**English Heritage response to survey:**
Wymondham is especially notable for the quality and integrity of its historic core and highly significant abbey, within a sensitive landscape setting. We recommend that areas of landscape should be safeguarded where important views or settings exist, such as the landscape to the north west and south west of Wymondham Abbey. The Area Action Plan should also seek to define important views.

Question 18
Does Wymondham need more publically accessible open space?

[Pie chart showing 61% Yes and 39% No]

731 respondents answered this question. The majority of them (61%) said yes Wymondham did need more publically accessible open space.

This question gave people the opportunity to tell us where they thought more publically accessible open space should be located. This question was deliberately open ended so as not to influence people's answers. Many people said that Wymondham does not need any more publically accessible open space at the present time as long as existing open space is protected, although there was acknowledgement that more open space is likely to be needed to cope with the new
housing development in Wymondham. There was concern expressed that more parks and play areas are needed in the town for children and young people.

A number of people took the opportunity to suggest particular locations for publically accessible open space. Of those suggested the top 3 were:

1. Kings Head Meadow
2. Tiffey Valley
3. Tuttles Lane

Wymondham High School response to survey: Extend the sports and play facilities within Wymondham. South Norfolk Council should work with the academy to develop a shared all weather pitch adjacent to the leisure centre on academy land. In addition to the green spaces that would be provided as part of any housing development South Norfolk Council should commit to providing additional sports and play areas to compensate for the shortfall in the academy site. South Norfolk Council should commit to not allow any development on existing green spaces within 10 minutes walk of the school.

Question 19
The above questions give us some idea about how to plan for the future of Wymondham, but there could be something we have missed. Please give us your views on how best to deliver the growth and improvements in Wymondham

This question enabled people to make any other comments they wished to raise in relation to Wymondham. It was answered by 608 respondents. There was a wide variety of answers given, these can be broadly categorised as followed:

1. The need for new/improvement to existing services and facilities
2. Town centre issues
3. No further development in Wymondham
4. Supermarket issues
5. More consultation needed with local people
6. Transport issues
7. Smaller estates rather than larger developments
8. The need to retain distinctive local identity
9. Parking issues
10. Affordable housing
11. Sustainability issues
**Monitoring from survey**

53% of respondents were male, 47% were female

The highest proportion of respondents were in the 55-64 age group (21%)
60% of respondents to the survey were aged over 55, 34% of respondents were aged between 35 and 54 and only 7% were aged under 35.

![Pie chart showing age distribution](chart.png)

In terms of ethnicity, 99% of respondents came from a white background.

55% of respondents wished to be kept informed about progress on the AAP, their details will be retained and they will be notified of future stages in the preparation of the plan.

**Key Messages**

Detailed analysis of results from the ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey has shown a great degree of similarity between the answers given to this survey, those to the 2007 study previously carried out in Wymondham and the questionnaires completed at Wymondham High School and Wymondham College. This demonstrates that there is a strong feeling about particular issues across the town and that the same issues are as relevant now as they were 5 years ago.
A number of key messages can be identified:

Key messages emerging from South Norfolk consultation:
- Preserve unique market town identity
- Preserve historical character of town
- Preserve natural environment
- Provide local employment opportunities
- A number of smaller developments favoured over large developments
- Important to improve medical & health facilities, schools and education and surface water and sewerage when providing new developments
- Greater choice of shops and services in town centre
- Support for a new supermarket
- Support for start up units for new businesses
- Maintain gap between Wymondham and Hethersett
- Need for more publically accessible open space

These key messages will now be used to develop a Vision and Objectives to underpin the Wymondham Area Action Plan. The Vision and Objectives from the 2007 Community Study are also given below as these will also form an important starting point for the AAP visioning work.

‘Wymondham’s Future – Strategic Plan 2008-2013’

Common Vision:
‘Wymondham – a forward looking market town recognising the need for sustainable growth whilst retaining a strong sense of its own identity’

Objectives:
Community ‘Support a vibrant local community where all age groups can develop and enjoy the quality of life Wymondham can offer’
Development ‘Protect Wymondham’s cultural and historic heritage and ensure that the town’s growth and economy progresses in a controlled manner’
Environment ‘Improve access to the surrounding countryside and protect the town’s open spaces’
Transport ‘Seek ways of improving public transport services and traffic management’

Conclusion and Next Stages

The information in this report provides a good basis from which to prepare a more detailed Area Action Plan for Wymondham.

The next stage is to develop a Vision and Objectives to be agreed at Cabinet in June 2012. This Vision and Objectives will then be used to develop a more detailed Preferred Options document for further public consultation in autumn 2012. The Preferred Options document will be prepared using the information in this report, representations received to earlier public consultations and detailed site assessments of individual sites suggested for development. The Preferred Options document will also make land allocations to meet the requirements of the JCS.
Appendix 1

Minutes of the 20 January public meeting chaired by George Freeman MP

(To follow…)
# Appendix 2

## Summary of other responses to the public consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Breckland Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draws attention to issues and evidence base that may be of relevance at next stage in process e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Water management/Water efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Knock on effect of delivery of energy to support housing and employment growth in Attleborough and Snetterton Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Transport e.g. new distributor road between A11 and B1077, impact on A11 trunk road and Highways Agency view, improvements to rail services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Update on progress with Attleborough and Snetterton Heath AAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2. Terence O’Rourke Ltd on behalf of Endurance Estates (South Wymondham)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land to the south of Wymondham is a suitable and sustainable location for deliverable development, application currently submitted for 750 homes, care home, small shop and primary school. Site has locational advantages, can provide material benefits to the town and meet the policy requirements of the Joint Core Strategy. Also in accordance with national policy. The AAP needs to be in conformity with the JCS and therefore the gap between Wymondham and Hethersett must be maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3. Environment Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development within Wymondham should take account of the environmental constraints/opportunities of the area. For example, flood risk and surface water drainage, land contamination, groundwater vulnerability, the capacity of the foul water infrastructure (waste water treatment works and foul sewer network), ecology and impacts upon environmentally designated sites, proximity to a watercourse and green and blue infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAP should include a policy/guidance on the issue of surface water management. Consideration should be given to the SuDS management train in order to enhance water quality and amenity value, at the same time as promoting a reduction in flood risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wymondham and Long Stratton near top of list of settlements at risk from flooding in the NCC Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment and consultation with NCC will be beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The South Norfolk SFRA should also be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment Agency preference is for the foul flows generated to be treated at the local WwTW. Maybe issues with process capacity and the capacity of the sewer network and further discussion will be needed with Anglian Water Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **English Heritage**

Wymondham is especially notable for the quality and integrity of its historic core and highly significant abbey, within a sensitive landscape setting. We recommend that areas of landscape should be safeguarded where important views or settings exist, such as the landscape to the north west and south west of Wymondham Abbey. The Area Action Plan should also seek to define important views. English Heritage have already made detailed comments on individual sites.

5. **The Fairfield Partnership representing land off Chapel Lane**

Proposed development off Chapel Lane can meet requirements of the JCS because of its sustainable location close to the town centre and public transport facilities and the fact that the JCS states that development should be located in a number of sites around the town. In fact Question 5 is misleading as it implies that residents are able to decide whether development should be in a single location or spread around. Development in this location also has potential to improve accessibility to the Tiffey valley and open up high quality views of the Abbey to the public.

6. **Suffolk County Council**

Potential impacts on Suffolk, particularly the A11 and A140 are properly recognised. Not simply the impact of development within the AAP area, but also the cumulative impact across the South of Norfolk/North of Suffolk as appropriate e.g. Thetford.

7. **Norfolk County Council – Minerals and Waste**

A number of sites are already safeguarded as part of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. An identified mineral resource occurs in the area surrounding Wymondham, the allocation of sites for future development on this resource is not discouraged as long as appropriate measure are taken. Policy wording suggested

8. **Wymondham High School**

Overall growth of Wymondham needs to be capped at 2,200 houses or a new secondary school will be required as current academy site can only just cope with the 2,200 houses. Growth beyond this will require a more radical solution.

New development in Wymondham needs to be linked by safe pedestrian and cycle routes to the academy site

Extend the sports and play facilities within Wymondham. South Norfolk Council should work with the academy to develop a shared all weather pitch adjacent to the leisure centre on academy land. In addition to the green spaces that would be provided as part of any housing development South Norfolk Council should commit to providing additional sports and play areas to compensate for the shortfall in the academy site. South Norfolk Council should commit to not allow
any development on existing green spaces within 10 minutes walk of the school.

9. **The Wymondham Approach**

Promotes a cycling between Wymondham and Norwich. Missing links are:

- Improve/designate footpath to cycle path from Downham Grove to Elm Farm Business Park
- Create foot/cycle path past Ketts Oak
- Heritage angle of Ketts Oak
- Further cycle path improvements going into Norwich

10. **Highways Agency**

Highways Agency will require demonstrations of the existing usage of A11 junctions in the vicinity of Wymondham together with forecast usage to be satisfied that the junctions continue to operate and be no worse off with development than without it. The requirement to be no worse off may mean that mitigation highway works will be necessary and this must be included in the Wymondham AAP. Development should be such that the need for vehicular travel is minimised and the use of public transport, cycling and walking are encouraged and the enforcement of robust Travel Plans should be the norm.

11. **Cllr Robert Savage**

- All previous and future development in Wymondham relevant under the JCS must count towards 2,200 target
- None of the NPA floating 1,800 to be allocated to Wymondham
- Large retail/industrial development that generate significant traffic should be on major routes/on the outskirts of town
- Housing should be in smaller blocks of 300-400
- Maintain gaps between settlements e.g. Wym/Hethersett
- Maintain view of R. Tiffey valley
- Preserve views of Wymondham Abbey on approaches to town
- Stop development along B1172 before Ketts Oak
- Keep Kings Head Meadow as an open space in town centre
- Retail centre to develop along Station Road end of Ayton Road
- Railway bridge on Silfield Lane cannot accommodate traffic from major traffic generating development.

12. **Mid Norfolk Railway Preservation Trust**

Proposal to construct a new station immediately to north west of current main line station in the area of the cutting between this station and the Cemetery Lane crossing, within the next 5 years. This opportunity arises due to the re-signalling of the Ely to Norwich main line. This will allow for the re-signalling of the junction with the Dereham branch and realignment of the tracks. The new MNR station would be accessible by visitors from the main line station as well as from Cemetery Lane. Request for proposals to be included in the Wymondham Area Action Plan.

13. **Peter Harradine – Quiet Lanes proposal**

Proposal for the creation of quiet lanes between Wymondham, Suton and Spooner Row to improve road safety, environmental improvement, creation of a rural leisure area and a cost saving on road maintenance. Roads include Suton Lane, Eleven Mile Lane, Sawyers Lane, Suton Street, Cheepore Lane and Chapel Road.
by using cycle and horse only gates, closing Cheepore Lane at roundabout junction and using suitable road traffic signs at junctions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14.</th>
<th>John Long, Bidwells on behalf of Wrenbridge (Harts Farm) Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting land at Browick Road (Sites 570 and 571 in the LDF). Surprised that these sites were not included as options for the location of 20 hectares of employment land with in Wymondham. Support the figure of 20 hectares of employment land within the AAP and suggest that this should be seen as a minimum. AAP should allocate ‘at least’ 20 hectares of employment land in Wymondham. Existing employment sites in Wymondham are close to being fully occupied and proposals for other new employment allocations in the town are dependent on major housing and infrastructure proposals coming forward e.g. north or south Wymondham. No barriers to development at Browick Road and the principle of development has been considered acceptable with the allocation of a rail freight depot and planning permission for a print works. The site at Browick Road is suitable, available and deliverable to accommodate a range of commercial uses. The site is being actively marketed and a planning application may be forthcoming during 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15.</th>
<th>Natural England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are a number of environmental constraints which should be considered when allocating sites for development e.g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- International and national nature conservation sites e.g. SPA, SAC, SSSIs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Locally and regionally designated sites for geodiversity and biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Landscape character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UK BAP habitats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sites where there is opportunity for biodiversity gain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ancient woodland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Access to greenspace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlikely that delivery of growth in Wymondham will have an adverse effect on statutory nature conservation sites. Advise that development proposals should aim to avoid damage to existing biodiversity features and create opportunities for enhancing biodiversity through the delivery of local Biodiversity Action Plan targets. Consideration should be given to the quality of soil resources on potential development sites, poor quality agricultural land should be used in preference to that of higher quality. A landscape character approach should be used to underpin decisions on development. Green Infrastructure should be an integral part of the creation of sustainable communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16.</th>
<th>Chris Smith, Hopkins Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued commitment to promotion of Site 174 – Land at Gunvil Hall Farm for a mixed use residential and commercial development with associated public open space and community facilities. Site is well related to existing town centre, railway station and existing highway network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17. | **Theatres Trust**  
The leaflet gives details of all the serious elements of the town that will require upgrading or the provision of new, but it doesn’t mention the social infrastructure that is so important for residents quality of life and a vibrant evening economy. Physical activity and social and intellectual stimulation are vital ingredients for a healthy lifestyle. This requires people to have access to facilities such as libraries, museums, performance spaces, play sport and enjoy walking in open spaces.

Wymondham Central Hall is a valuable facility that supports many local groups. It is vital that such venues are supported by the Council and allowed to expand and we hope such venues are included in any plans to enhance social infrastructure. |

| 18. | **Vision Our Wymondham**  
Wymondham should remain a beautiful market town and not a part of Greater Norwich. 2,200 house should not be exceeded as this would be to the detrimental character of the town, existing developments falling within the timeframe should be counted towards the 2,200. The gap between Wymondham and Hethersett should remain. Support for smaller developments that encourage residents to feel part of the town and interact accordingly. Houses should be built on brownfield sites and then poor quality land before building on good quality agricultural land.

Development should reflect the character of Wymondham as a historic rural Norfolk market town. Areas of natural beauty within and around Wymondham should be protected. Services, schools, doctors etc should be planned alongside new developments. Commercial/industrial development should be on brownfield sites and maximise the use to existing business estates before future commercial development is planned. |

| 19. | **Barton Willmore**  
Seek clarification about how responses to the formal Reg 25 sites consultations will be used in the formation of the Wymondham AAP. Is the current AAP consultation a formal Reg 25 consultation or an ‘informal’ consultation? There is a significant delay to the published LDS (Feb 2010) which identified an adoption date of July 2012. Previous response submitted to the sites consultation (Nov 2011) which demonstrate the deliverability and overall benefits of a single large development at NE Wymondham to deliver 2,200 dwellings. Concern about how the questionnaire is worded and that the questions are too vague for preferred options to be chosen and no evidence base has been released to support the questions asked. The consultation is a missed opportunity as the identification of specific sites in Wymondham would have provided for a much more focussed response. Concern about where and when ‘reasonable alternatives’ will be considered and consulted upon.  

Consider that an area of open land should be maintained between Wymondham and Hethersett however in accordance with PPS7 the extent of separation should only be sufficient to maintain the gap and should not extend beyond the area that is required to be perceived as the gap or function of the gap. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. DPP Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New supermarket should be located on the Former Saleground site at Station Road. Development boundary should be extended to accommodate this land. Site will provide a transport interchange and linkages between the south of Wymondham and the town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic gap should be maintained between Wymondham and Hethersett to retain the identities of the respective settlements and prevent urban sprawl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Head Meadow is an important piece of open space within the heart of the town that provides valuable and accessible recreational space to the residents of Wymondham and should be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large scale residential development should be accommodated on land to the south of Wymondham. This will protect the strategic gap between Wymondham and Hethersett to the north and protect the important views and heritage assets to the west of the town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21. Anglian Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The nature of the consultation and who it is targeting does not include Anglian Water as water and wastewater provider and therefore no comments are made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

The Council is preparing an Area Action Plan (AAP) for Wymondham to identity sites for future development and co-ordinate provision in line with the strategic policies in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which was formally adopted in March 2011. The purpose of this document is to use evidence from previous public consultations balanced against the requirements of the JCS and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to present a Vision and Objectives for the AAP. The Vision and Objectives provide a common framework for the AAP, drawing on views from a variety of stakeholders. The Vision and Objectives will be used as the basis for a more detailed Preferred Options document for public consultation in autumn 2012.

Vision

‘Wymondham - a forward looking market town which embraces sustainable growth to enhance its unique identity and sense of community, whilst ensuring that its historic character and natural environment are preserved for future generations to enjoy’

Objectives

Housing:
‘2,200 new houses will be built on a number of sites around the town meeting the highest standards of design, energy efficiency and affordability whilst recognising the need to sustain and improve the distinctive character of Wymondham and provide the necessary infrastructure and public open space to support new development’

Employment:
‘20 hectares of land will be developed for a range of employment uses to support local employment opportunities and economic growth in and around Wymondham, building on the historically strong take-up of employment land in the town and Wymondham's prominent position on the A11 Corridor. To improve links with and accessibility to strategic employment growth at Hethel technology park’

Environment:
‘A ‘Ketts Country’ pastoral landscape of grass, wood, hedgerow and wetland habitat will be created to strengthen the role of the Tiffey valley and maintain the open land between Wymondham and Hethersett with the aim of protecting and enhancing the historic landscape setting of the town and abbey’

Recreation:
‘The health, well being and quality of life of local residents will be improved and the unique character and sense of community that already exists within the town will be maintained and enhanced by protecting existing public open space in the town from development and providing additional public open space to support new development’
Town Centre:
‘Wymondham town centre will be improved and expanded to give a greater choice of shops and services whilst retaining and enhancing its distinct historic core and its role as a vibrant market town’

Accessibility:
‘The use of public transport (both bus and rail) will be maximised and safe and direct pedestrian and cycle routes will be provided to link key locations in and around Wymondham and to enhance longer distance access to Hethersett, the Norwich Research Park and employment expansion at Hethel’

Developing the Vision and Objectives

The following section presents evidence to support how the Vision and Objectives were derived. For background information about previous public consultations, the requirements of the JCS and policy in the NPPF see later sections of this report.

The Vision

The ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey asked:
‘What is important about Wymondham now?’
‘What type of place should Wymondham be in 2026?’
‘How do you use Wymondham?’

The results of the ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey told us:
- Wymondham’s unique identity as an historic market town, preservation of the natural environment, the quality of local schools, local employment opportunities, the availability of housing, community spirit and the range of services and facilities were all considered to be important about Wymondham now.
- In 2026 Wymondham should be a historic market town whose character is recognised and protected, a market town with a good range of shops and services and a residential town with local employment opportunities.
- People are most likely to use Wymondham for healthcare (doctors, dentist, pharmacy), services (banking, hairdresser, solicitor) and day to day shopping needs (food & household items).

The ‘Wymondham’s Future – Strategic Plan 2008-2013’ Vision states:
‘Wymondham – a forward looking market town recognising the need for sustainable growth whilst retaining a strong sense of its own identity’

The JCS states:
Wymondham is identified as a location for major growth and the JCS allocates at least 2,200 dwellings and 20 hectares of employment land, although it also refers to maintaining the historic setting of the town and abbey.
The NPPF states:
At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Planning should be genuinely plan-led empowering local people to shape their surroundings, enhancing and improving the places in which people live their lives. There are 3 dimensions to sustainable development; an economic role (contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy), a social role (supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities by providing a supply of housing and creating a high quality built environment) and an environmental role (contributing to protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment).

It is proposed to:
Develop a vision which recognises that although Wymondham needs to grow in accordance with policies in the JCS, this growth should be sustainable and planned in a way that retains its unique market town character and sense of community spirit whilst protecting the natural environment and historic setting of the town.

**Vision**
‘Wymondham - a forward looking market town which embraces sustainable growth to enhance its unique identity and sense of community, whilst ensuring that its historic character and natural environment are preserved for future generations to enjoy’

**Objective for Housing**

The ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey asked:
‘What type of housing development would you support in Wymondham to accommodate at least 2,200 new homes?’
‘Where would you prefer to see new housing development located?’
‘When building new houses in Wymondham, how important is it for the following things to be provided?’

The results of the ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey told us:
- Clear support for a number of smaller developments around the town
- Important for services and facilities to be provided to support new development, particularly medical and health services, schools and education facilities and surface water and sewerage improvements.

The ‘Wymondham’s Future – Strategic Plan 2008-2013’ Vision states:
- Clear support for a series of small scale developments and opposition to big developments
- Important for services and facilities to be provided to support new development particularly medical/health services, educational facilities, surface water and sewerage improvements and town centre/retail services
The JCS states:
There is a requirement to allocate land for at least 2,200 dwellings located on a number of sites providing easy access to local jobs, services and facilities and the town centre. The JCS also mentions new pre school provision, a new primary school, the need to address secondary school provision and an expanded household waste recycling facility. Policies in the JCS also cover energy efficiency, design and the provision of affordable housing.

The NPPF states:
Local authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Authorities should look to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities.

It is proposed to:
Develop an objective related to the provision of new housing in Wymondham that reflects the JCS requirements to allocate land for at least 2,200 new houses on a number of sites, whilst having regard to sustainability, design and affordable housing criteria and also reflects public opinion that the new housing should be on a number of smaller sites around the town and that the necessary services and facilities need to be provided to support the new development. There is a counter argument that a single large development would help to provide services and facilities such as a new primary school but this is not supported by public opinion or the wording in the JCS.

**Housing Objective:**
‘2,200 new houses will be built on a number of sites around the town meeting the highest standards of design, energy efficiency and affordability whilst recognising the need to sustain and improve the distinctive character of Wymondham and provide the necessary infrastructure and public open space to support new development’

**Objective for Employment**

The ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey asked:
‘What sort of employment opportunities are needed in Wymondham?’
‘Where should up to 20 hectares (50 acres) of new employment land be located in Wymondham?’

The results of the ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey told us:
- Local employment opportunities were thought to be one of the most important things about Wymondham now.
- Clear support for the provision of start up units for small businesses
The JCS states:
Policy 9 of the JCS lists Wymondham as a strategic employment location and provides for general employment opportunities in the town, including a new allocation of around 15 hectares. The supporting text to the policy specifies a total of around 20 hectares of employment land for a range of employment uses, including new allocations of around 15 hectares. Policy 9 also promotes expansion of activity at Hethel, including a technology park of around 20 hectares, with improved accessibility to Wymondham.

The NPPF states:
The Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support economic growth. Local authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century.

It is proposed to:
Develop an objective for the provision of new employment land in Wymondham that reflects the JCS requirement to allocate around 20 hectares but also reflects public opinion regarding the importance of local employment opportunities and the provision of opportunities for new start up businesses. The objective should also promote links to strategic employment expansion at Hethel.

Employment Objective:
‘20 hectares of land will be developed for a range of employment uses to support local employment opportunities and economic growth in and around Wymondham, building on the historically strong take-up of employment land in the town and Wymondham's prominent position on the A11 Corridor. To improve links with and accessibility to strategic employment growth at Hethel Technology Park.’

Objective for Environment

The ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey asked:
‘Do you agree that an area of open and undeveloped land should be maintained between Wymondham and Hethersett to stop the two places merging together?’
‘Please tell us about any important spaces or views in and around Wymondham that you think should be protected?’

The results of the ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey told us:
- Clear support for maintaining an area of open and undeveloped land between Wymondham and Hethersett, so that both places retain their individual identities
- The Tiffey Valley, The Lizard, the area around the Abbey and the views from Chapel Lane across the Tiffey Valley were considered to be important areas to protect.
The JCS states:
That housing should be planned in a way that maintains the strategic gap to the north and north east of the town and the historic setting of the town and abbey. It also states that extensive levels of green infrastructure should be put in place to create a ‘Ketts Country’ pastoral landscape of grass, woodland, hedgerow and wetland to strengthen the importance of the Tiffey Valley and protect the landscape setting of the town.

The NPPF states:
Local authorities should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.

It is proposed to:
Develop an objective to reflect the requirements of the JCS and public opinion regarding the importance of the open land between Wymondham and Hethersett and the desire to protect important spaces and views within and around the town such as the Tiffey Valley and the area around the Abbey.

Environment Objective:
‘A ‘Ketts Country’ pastoral landscape of grass, wood, hedgerow and wetland habitat will be created to strengthen the role of the Tiffey valley and maintain the open land between Wymondham and Hethersett with the aim of protecting and enhancing the historic landscape setting of the town and abbey’

Objective for Recreation

The ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey asked:
‘Please tell us about any important spaces or views in and around Wymondham that you think should be protected?’
Does Wymondham need more publically accessible open space?’

The results of the ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey told us:
- It was seen as important to protect existing open spaces such as Kings Head and the Tiffey Valley from development.
- Many people said that Wymondham does not need any more publically accessible open space at the present time as long as existing open space is protected, although there was acknowledgement that more open space is likely to be needed to cope with the new housing development proposed in Wymondham.

The JCS states:
Objective 11 of the JCS encourages the development of healthy and active lifestyles and states that the accessibility to open space, the countryside, sports and recreational facilities will be improved. Policy 7 states that all development will be expected to maintain or enhance quality of life and the well being of communities and will promote equality and diversity as well as protect and strengthen community cohesion.
The NPPF states:
Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. Existing open space, sports and recreational land and buildings should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which clearly shows it to be surplus to requirements, if the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision or if the development is for alternative sports and recreation provision, the need for which clearly outweighs the loss. Local communities can identify green areas of particular importance to them for special protection as ‘Local Green Spaces’ when development plans are being prepared or reviewed.

It is proposed to:
Develop an objective to reflect the JCS requirement to encourage healthy lifestyles and promote the well being and improved quality of life of residents as well as to reflect public opinion that existing public open spaces should be protected from development and that additional public open space should be provided as part of any new housing development.

Recreation Objective:
‘The health, well being and quality of life of local residents will be improved and the unique character and sense of community that already exists within the town will be maintained and enhanced by protecting existing public open space in the town from development and providing additional public open space to support new development’

Objective for the Town Centre:

The ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey asked:
‘How do you think Wymondham Town Centre could be improved?’

The results of the ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey told us:
- A clear majority of people wanted to see a greater choice of shops and services in the town centre

The JCS states:
That there will be expansion of the town centre of a quality that will retain and enhance the distinctive character of the historic centre. Policy 19 of the JCS recognises Wymondham as a vibrant market town.

The NPPF states:
Planning policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments and set out policies for the management and growth of centres. Town centres should be recognised as the heart of their communities and provide customer choice and a diverse retail offer which reflects the individuality of the centre.
It is proposed to:
Develop an objective that reflects the requirements of the JCS in terms of
town centre expansion and reflects public opinion that there should be a
greater choice of shops and services in the centre, whilst retaining and
enhancing the historic character of the town.

Town Centre Objective:
‘Wymondham town centre will be improved and expanded to give a greater
choice of shops and services whilst retaining and enhancing its distinct historic
core and its role as a vibrant market town’

Objective for Accessibility

The ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey asked:
‘What would encourage you to walk and cycle more for local journeys?’
‘Do you regularly use public transport (e.g. bus/rail) to travel to and from
Wymondham?’
‘How do you rate the service?’
‘How would you like to see the service improve?’

The results of the ‘Wymondham 2026’ survey told us:
- There was clear support for safer routes e.g. separate from traffic to
  encourage people to walk and cycle more.
- There was a fairly even 50/50 split between those who did and did not
  use the bus with a more distinct split with regard to train travel. The
  majority of respondents did not use the train service to and from
  Wymondham.

The JCS states:
There should be enhanced bus services to the city centre with potential for a
Bus Rapid Transit link to serve Hethersett and/or Cringleford and
improvements to maximise the use of rail connections. There should also
be safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes linking key locations in and
around Wymondham, including new residential developments, the town
centre, the railway station and Gateway 11 business park as well as
enhanced longer distance cycle access to Hethersett and the Norwich
Research Park. JCS policy also promotes enhanced public transport and
cycle links to employment expansion at Hethel.

The NPPF states:
Transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable
development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health
objectives. The transport system needs to be balanced in favour of
sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they
travel.
It is proposed to:
Develop an objective that reflects the JCS policy with regard to accessibility, in particular use of public transport and the provision of pedestrian and cycle routes.

**Accessibility Objective:**
‘The use of public transport (both bus and rail) will be maximised and safe and direct pedestrian and cycle routes will be provided to link key locations in and around Wymondham and to enhance longer distance access to Hethersett, the Norwich Research Park and employment expansion at Hethel’

**Requirements of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS)**

Wymondham is identified in the JCS as a sustainable location for major growth and it has the highest level of development proposed in any of the named growth locations in South Norfolk. The AAP must be conformity with the policies in the JCS and these will need to be reflected in the vision and objectives.

Policy 10 from the JCS states that development in Wymondham is dependent on expanded capacity of the A11/A47 Thickthorn junction and will deliver expansion of the town to include:

- At least 2,200 dwellings located in a number of sites providing easy access to local jobs, services and facilities and the town centre whilst maintaining the strategic gap to the north and north east and the historic setting of the town and abbey
- Expansion of the town centre of a quality that will retain and enhance the distinctive character of the historic centre
- Extensive levels of green infrastructure to create a ‘Ketts Country’ pastoral landscape of grass, wood, hedgerow and wetland habitat. This will also strengthen the importance and role of the Tiffey valley, the landscape setting of the town and strategic gaps, particularly towards Hethersett
- Enhanced bus services to the city centre with potential for Bus Rapid Transit also serving Hethersett and/or Cringleford and improvements to maximise the use of rail connections
- Safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes linking key locations in and around Wymondham including new residential developments, the town centre, the railway station and Gateway 11 business park and enhanced longer distance cycle access to Hethersett and Norwich Research Park.
- Enhanced public transport and cycle links to employment expansion at Hethel
- New pre-school provision and a new primary school. Secondary education provision remains to be resolved but may require the relocation of the existing high school to a new site
- Expanded household waste recycling facility
**The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

The NPPF was published in March 2012 and sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It provides a framework within which local people and Councils can produce their own distinctive plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities. When developing the Vision and Objectives reference has been made to policies within the NPPF where relevant.

**Public Consultations**

The Council have gathered evidence about public opinion in Wymondham through a number of public consultations.

Wymondham Town Council undertook a Community Survey in 2007, working together with Wymondham Community Partnership, South Norfolk Council, the Business Forum and a number of community organisations. The survey resulted in the publication of a document called ‘Wymondhams Future – Strategic Plan 2008-2013. This survey was a useful starting point when developing the AAP as it already gave a wealth of information about public opinion in Wymondham.

The Council asked broad questions about the potential content of the AAP as part of the consultation process into the Site Specific Policies and Allocations document. We also asked for comments about individual site suggestions. The first publication into this document took place between 1st September and 19th November 2010 and a second consultation took place between 29th August and 18th November 2011.

The Council undertook a focussed consultation on the Wymondham AAP between 23 January and 16 March 2012. A leaflet and survey entitled ‘Wymondham 2026 – Shaping the future development of your town’ were prepared in conjunction with Wymondham Town Council and sent to all homes and businesses in the Parish of Wymondham, including Spooner Row and Suton. The aim was to gather people’s views about future development in Wymondham.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion the Vision and Objectives for the Wymondham AAP are as proposed in this document. These will be subject to public consultation as part of the Preferred Options public consultation in autumn 2012.

Local Plan Policy Manager

This report recommends a suggested response to Norfolk County Council’s publication of its Pre-Submission versions of its Minerals and Waste Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cabinet member(s): John Fuller</th>
<th>Ward(s) affected:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail: | David Willis 01508 533809
dwillis@s-norfolk.gov.uk |

1. Background

1.1. The Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework comprises a Core Strategy and Development Management Development Plan Document, and separate Minerals and Waste Sites Specific Allocations Development Plan Documents. In combination these provide for the consideration of sites for Norfolk’s minerals requirements and waste forecasts to the end of 2026. The proposed allocation of sites for each in South Norfolk will have impacts on local roads, residential amenity and the general quality of life. Therefore it is important to ensure that the appropriate considerations are applied to the allocation of sites.

1.2. Cabinet had previously responded to Norfolk County Council’s Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework Minerals Site Allocations and Waste Site Allocations Revised Further Issues and Options consultations on 6 September 2011.

1.3. The council’s response letter to the September 2011 consultations is shown in Appendix 1.
2. **Current Position and Issues**

2.1. The County Council has published its Pre-Submission versions of its Minerals and Waste Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Documents (DPDs) for representations to be made by 29 June 2012. The separate Minerals and Waste Site Specific Allocations DPDs and their supporting documents can be viewed on the County Council’s web site at www.norfolk.gov.uk/nmwdf and are available for inspection at South Norfolk Council.

2.2. The provisions of the Minerals and Waste Site Specific Allocations DPDs have taken into consideration the results of three consultations held by the County Council in 2008 (Issues and Options), 2009 (Further Issues and Options) and 2011 (Revised Further Issues and Options).

2.3. This consultation seeks representations focussing on the soundness and legal compliance of the DPDs. Representations on the way in which the County Council has prepared the DPDs should be related to legal compliance issues. Representations related to the content of the DPDs should be related to whether it is justified, effective, positively prepared or consistent with national policy.

2.4. This report compares the South Norfolk minerals and waste site provisions to this council’s responses to the Further Issues and Options consultations in September 2011 (see Appendices 2 and 3), and recommends appropriate responses. The suggested responses include the views of the Director of Planning and Built Environment.

2.5. The next steps will be the County Council’s submission of the documents to the Secretary of State. Representations will be considered alongside the published DPDs when submitted. The following stage will be the examination of the DPDs by a planning inspector.

3. **Proposal and Reasons**

3.1. **Mineral site provisions:** The 2011 consultations included assessments of some 23 potential minerals sites in South Norfolk of which 6 were proposed to be allocated. These were sites reference MIN 79 land north of Hickling Lane, Swardeston; MIN 80 land south of Mangreen Hall Farm, Swardeston; MIN 81 land south of Mangreen Lane, Stoke Holy Cross; MIN 83 extension to Norton Subcourse Quarry, Loddon Road; MIN 90 extension to Norton Subcourse Quarry, Loddon Road and MIN 91 and extension to Norton Subcourse Quarry, Loddon Road. South Norfolk Council supported the proposed allocations subject to the comments shown in Appendix 2.

3.2. During the 2011 consultation site ref: MIN 54 at Marlingford was withdrawn. This raised the issue of a sand and gravel shortfall and the need to find a replacement site preferably near to Norwich. A newly proposed site at Wymondham (MIN 118) adjacent to the oil depot on Stanfield Road was also included in the 2011 consultation, but initially assessed by the County Council, as not required and thus not to be allocated. South Norfolk Council supported this view at the time.
3.3. The 2012 Pre-Submission Site Specific Allocations DPD allocates the 6 previously proposed site allocations listed in paragraph 3.1 above, but also allocates Wymondham site ref. MIN 118.

3.4. Appendix 2 shows the issues raised about site MIN 118 during the 2011 consultation and the responses to those issues. The County Council considers that the site is suitable for allocation subject to the requirements shown in Appendix 2.

3.5. Wymondham site ref: MIN 118 thus provides for much of the resulting sand and gravel shortfall arising from the withdrawal of the Marlingford site and a reassessment of the potential extraction from other potential sites. The Wymondham site is well related to the area of major growth identified by the Joint Core Strategy within the Norwich Policy Area. The site reflects the general principle of locating mineral sites as near as possible to the areas of development–related demand and should be supported in this context subject to the conditions proposed.

3.6. The remaining mineral site allocations address the concerns raised in 2011 by this council as shown in Appendices 1 and 2. South Norfolk Council requested the inclusion of specific conditions to address site specific concerns. The Pre-Submission document provides for mineral site allocations where extraction is subject to a combination of specific requirements and compliance with the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies that were adopted on 26 September 2011.

3.7. This appears to be the general approach. The County Council has pointed out that conditions have been applied where work is outstanding and that some requirements such as schemes of restoration and transport arrangements depending on extraction rates would be too detailed for inclusion within these policies. This approach appears to be appropriate and should be supported.

3.8. **Waste management provisions:** The 2011 Further Issues and Options consultation considered thirteen potential waste sites in South Norfolk of which the County Council proposed to allocate three. These were sites reference WAS 31 land at Costessey Waste Transfer Station, Longwater Business Park, Costessey; WAS 58 land at Longwater Industrial Estate, Costessey and WAS 33 land at Pulham Market transfer station, Station Road, Tivetshall St Margaret. South Norfolk Council supported the Costessey and Tivetshall St Margaret sites, and objected to the non-allocation of the Bergh Apton Household Waste Recycling centre as shown in Appendix 3.

3.9. The 2012 Pre-Submission Allocations DPD allocates the 3 previously proposed site allocations listed in paragraph 3.8 above, but does not allocate the Bergh Apton Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) as shown in Appendix 3.

3.10. While this Council raised concerns about the potential uses of the Costessey sites and the need for further clarification regarding less controversial “thermal treatment” processes, the proposed policy provisions referred to in Appendix 3 appear to address this Council’s concerns.

3.11. With regard to the Bergh Apton HWRC, Appendix 3 shows the latest position. While there appear to be local concerns about the site’s location and its
accessibility, the site is an important site serving a large area and this Council continues to support the need for a household recycling centre in the area. For the reasons shown in Appendix 3 an objection should be raised to the non-allocation of this site.

3.12. Overall minerals and waste site provisions: Cabinet endorsement is sought for the conclusions reached in Appendices 2 and 3 that no objections should be raised to the site allocations and provisions where shown. In those cases no further comment would have to be made to the County Council. The exception is the recommended raising of an objection to the lack of an allocation for the household waste recycling centre (site reference WAS 26) at Bergh Apton. In terms of the tests of soundness, the objection would be on the basis that the proposal had not been justified. (For the suggested response see Appendix 4))

4. Other Options

4.1 The Council could choose not to respond to the consultation but this would not be in the best interests of South Norfolk residents. It is important to respond to ensure that the appropriate considerations are applied to the allocation of sites to avoid adverse impacts on the quality of life in South Norfolk.

5. Relevant Corporate Priorities

5.1. Enhancing our quality of life and the environment we live in: The proposed allocations provide for the needs of the growth proposed by the Joint Core Strategy while being subject to environmental protection and landscape restoration requirements.

5.2. Promoting a thriving local economy: The proposed allocations will provide employment in support of local economic growth.

6. Implications and Risks

6.1 Environmental: All allocations will have some environmental impact albeit their proposed provisions will rely on mitigations to remove or reduce those impacts.

6.2 Risks: Local quality of life may suffer detrimental impacts if the proposed minerals and waste sites are not developed subject to the appropriate conditions and mitigations as proposed.

7. Conclusion

7.1 There is a continuing need to provide for mineral extraction and waste treatment in Norfolk and South Norfolk. The provisions of the Minerals and Waste Site Specific Allocations Pre-Submission DPDs (in combination with the adopted Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies) provide for the concerns previously raised by this Council with the exception of the allocation of a household waste recycling centre at Bergh Apton. This report recommends the appropriate action in response to this.
8. Recommendations

8.1. It is recommended that Cabinet agrees the response shown in Appendix 4 and its submission to Norfolk County Council.
Dear Ms Jeffery

Norfolk Minerals and Waste LDF: Minerals Site Specific Allocation and Waste Site Specific Allocations DPDs: Consultation on Revised Further Issues and Options

Thank you for consulting South Norfolk Council. The Council Cabinet of 5 September 2011 resolved to endorse:

i) the responses (headed “South Norfolk Council response”) to the individual minerals and waste management site assessments as shown in the final column of the attached appendices A and B respectively.

ii) the need for clarification in the site specific allocations document of the consequences of the withdrawal of the Marlingford minerals site (Ref: MIN 54) for the need to allocate an alternative site or sites to make up for the resulting shortfall in sand and gravel.

iii) the need for the clarification of the definition of “thermal treatment” in relation to the proposed limitations on the use of Costessey waste management site allocation Ref: WAS 31. While the County Council has concluded that thermal treatment processes (which include incineration) may produce nitrogen harmful to the River Wensum SAC, the term “thermal treatment” may include other “greener” processes such as composting and anaerobic digestion. This should be clarified in any proposed policy limitations on the use of this site.

iv) South Norfolk Council’s support for proposed Policy WWTW 1.

v) the need for the County Council to include conditions in the minerals and waste site specific allocations policies to address site specific concerns, rather than to rely on their consideration at the planning application stage or on generic development control policies.

Yours sincerely,

David Willis
Senior Planning Officer
Planning and Housing Policy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>County Council 2011 assessment (summarised)</th>
<th>South Norfolk Council response 2011</th>
<th>County Council Pre-Submission Policy Summary 2012</th>
<th>South Norfolk Council Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIN79 – Land north of Hickling Lane, Swardeston</td>
<td>Allocated Acknowledges public rights of way along north and south boundaries, ponds north-south across the site, small copse (Sprows Pit) on southern boundary, screening between site and Gowthorpe Manor and barn, limited hedge to the west boundary and the need for significant planting and a possible limit to extraction to the south west to limit impacts on the two properties to the south west (Hall Green Cottages). Concludes suitable to be worked from south to the north before adjacent sites MIN 80 and MIN 81 to the north, subject to conditions “within any future application” that include an appropriate agreed scheme of working and restoration a noise and dust assessment re impacts on adjacent properties and public rights of way that material extracted would be removed by conveyor for processing at the existing processing plant (i.e. to west of A140)</td>
<td>Comment: Notes that the withdrawal of Marlingford site MIN 54 produces a potential deficit in potential extraction from Norfolk sand and gravel allocations compared to total need which has been increased by the Core Strategy to provide for flexibility. A replacement site will be allocated in the proposed Submission Development Plan Document based on previous alternatives considered acceptable but not allocated. Although this could imply that a reduced site could be deliverable within the plan period, it remains unclear. Support allocation subject to the inclusion of suitable conditions within the site allocation policy to ensure that a significant area adjacent to Hall Green Cottages in the south west is not worked; to protect the Sprows Pit and copse; to provide for screening planting along the western and southern boundaries of the allocation alongside public rights of way to also protect the setting of the important listed buildings of Gowthorpe Manor and barn and their nearby housing in view of the allocation; the use of a conveyor which should also be suitably located and screened to minimise its impact on the nearby buildings; an agreed landscape restoration scheme to commence prior to allocated for sand and gravel subject to compliance with adopted Core Strategy and Development Management policies. Planning application to address Screening scheme mitigation of views including protection of setting of Listed Structures Mitigation of any amenity impacts and scheme of phased working and restoration Opportunities for geodiversity assets studies and archaeological evaluation Site to be phased before nearby sites MIN 80 and MIN 81 to ensure one site worked at a time Removal of material by conveyor for processing at existing Mangreen Quarry</td>
<td>This site forms part of a southern extension to the existing Mangreen quarry. The policy’s supporting text acknowledges the need as requested by South Norfolk Council to protect areas around Sprow’s Pit, Hall Farm Cottages, and nearby public rights of way by a combination of screening and stand-off buffer zones. While the proposed allocation policy refers to the above named features and to “the protection of the setting of the listed structures” in a generic way, any proposals for extraction will need to be decided within the context of these known requirements and the provisions of the Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies (M&amp;W DMP) that were adopted on 29 September 2011 (i.e. after the South Norfolk Council September 2011 Cabinet. The 2011 M&amp;W DMP such as policy DM8 which protects key landscape and townscape characteristics, and policy DM12 that protects the amenity of people living nearby through for example, buffer zones,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MIN80 – Land south of Mangreen Hall Farm, Swardeston | Allocated
The proposal acknowledges the location of the listed Mangreen Hall and farm buildings to the north but considers the impacts of them to be marginal due to intervening planting and modern farm buildings. The proposals are also that only the southern half of the site would be worked and that there should be further screening provided to the west and the north, thus further reducing any marginal impacts on Mangreen.

Concludes site would be suitable for allocation subject to the following conditions:
- an approved screening scheme to protect settings of listed buildings to the north
- use of a conveyor to transport material (across site MIN 81 to the
| the extraction of site MIN 80 to the north, and the phasing of the site to precede excavation of sites MIN 80 and MIN 81.

These important site specific elements should be included within the site specific policy and not left to the planning application or generic development control policies.

Comment: Notes also that the Mangreen area is not included in the Joint Core Strategy adopted in March 2011 as a potential location for major housing growth.
| Supports a reduced allocation provided that only the southern half of the originally proposed site is worked, subject to the inclusion of suitable conditions within the site allocation policy to protect the setting of the important listed buildings of Mangreen Hall and farm; provide for suitable screening planting to the west and the north; the use of a conveyor which should also be suitably located and screened to minimise its impact; an agreed landscape restoration scheme and the phasing of the site to commence after site MIN 79.

These important site specific elements should be included within the site specific policy and not left to the planning application or generic development control policies.

Comment: Notes also that the Mangreen area is not included in the Joint Core Strategy adopted in March 2011 as a potential location for major housing growth.
| Allocated for sand and gravel subject to compliance with adopted Core Strategy and Development Management policies. Planning application to address:
- Screening scheme mitigation of views including protection of setting of Listed Structures
- Mitigation of any amenity impacts and scheme of phased working and restoration
- Opportunities for geodiversity assets studies and archaeological evaluation
- Site to be phased after nearby site MIN 79 and before nearby MIN 81 to
| This site forms part of a southern extension to the existing Mangreen quarry.
Only the southern half of site is proposed for extraction
The policy’s supporting text acknowledges the need as requested by South Norfolk Council to protect the setting of Mangreen Hall farm and nearby public rights of way by a combination of screening and a stand-off buffer zones, the latter also including an area under the high tension power cables crossing the site.

While the proposed allocation policy refers to the above named features and to “the protection of the setting of the listed structures” in a generic way, any proposals for extraction will need to be decided within the context of these known requirements.
| MIN81 – Land south of Mangreen Lane, Stoke Holy Cross (parish) (Located to south east of Mangreen Hall Farm, to north of Sites MIN 79 and MIN 80) | Allocated | Comment: Notes that the withdrawal of Martlingford site MIN 54 produces a potential deficit in potential extraction from Norfolk sand and gravel allocations compared to total need which has been increased by the Core Strategy to provide for flexibility. A replacement site will be allocated in the proposed Submission Development Plan Document based on previous alternatives considered acceptable but not allocated. Although this could imply that the reduced site could be deliverable within the plan period, it remains unclear. Supports a reduced allocation provided that only the eastern half of the originally proposed site is worked, subject to the inclusion of suitable conditions within the site allocation policy to protect the setting of the important listed buildings of Mangreen Hall and farm; the use of a conveyor which should also be suitably located and screened to minimise its impact on the listed buildings; an agreed landscape restoration scheme and the phasing of the site. Important site specific elements | Allocated for sand and gravel subject to compliance with adopted Core Strategy and Development Management policies. Planning application to address • Screening scheme mitigation of views including protection of setting of Listed Structures • Mitigation of any amenity impacts and scheme of phased working and restoration • Opportunities for geodiversity assets studies and archaeological evaluation • Site to be phased after nearby sites MIN 79 and MIN 80 to ensure one site worked at a time • Removal of material by conveyor from A140 for materials | This site forms part of a southern extension to the existing Mangreen quarry. Broadly the eastern half of site has been allocated. The policy’s supporting text acknowledges the need as requested by South Norfolk Council to protect the setting of Mangreen Hall farm and nearby public rights of way by a combination of screening and a stand-off buffer zones, the latter also including an area under the high tension power cables crossing the site. While the proposed allocation policy refers to the above named features and to “the protection of the setting of the listed structures” in a generic way, any proposals for extraction will need to be decided within the context of these known requirements and the provisions of the Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies (M&WDM) as referred to above under site MIN 79. A combination of the proposed site allocation policy, its supporting text and requirements of the adopted Development Management policies cover South Norfolk Council’s areas of concern. Conclude no objection. |

| north) to the existing processing plant and the existing quarry access for transportation an agreed restoration scheme to meet landscape and ecology aspirations the site to be phased with adjacent sites to follow on from MIN 79 (to the south) so only one site is worked at a time | potential location for major housing growth. | ensure one site worked at a time - Removal of material by conveyor for processing at existing Mangreen Quarry and the provisions of the Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies (M&WDM) as referred to above under site MIN 79. |
| MIN83 – Extension to Norton Subcourse Quarry, Loddon Road | Allocated  
Concludes acceptable subject to conditions including  
- the use of the existing off highway haul route,  
- the application of conditions to limit the rate of extraction to no greater than current,  
- an agreed scheme of working and close co-operation with the Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership on scientific study on the site  
- a noise and dust assessment  
a hydrological impact assessment | Support provided that the suggested site specific conditions are included within the policy allocating the site. Such important conditions considered by the County Council to be required to make the site acceptable should be included within the site specific policy and not left to the planning application or generic development control policies. | Allocated for sand and gravel subject to compliance with adopted Core Strategy and Development Management policies. Planning application to address  
- Use of haul road from existing processing plant  
- Maximum extraction volumes limited to current maximum rate  
- Mitigation of any amenity impacts including noise and dust and scheme of phased working and restoration  
- Opportunities for geodiversity assets studies and archaeological evaluation  
- Agreed lighting scheme and other mitigations in consultation with Natural  
A combination of the proposed site allocation policy, its supporting text and requirements of the adopted Development Management policies cover South Norfolk Council’s areas of concern.  
Conclude no objection.  
The site is described as an extension to the existing Norton Subcourse Quarry.  
The policy provides for the previously identified requirements to be addressed by a planning application for extraction.  
The policy limits road access to the existing haul road and the cumulative levels of extraction to the maximum levels already permitted.  
Any proposals for extraction will need to be decided within the context of these known requirements and the provisions of the adopted Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies (M&WDMP) as referred to above under site MIN 79.  
A combination of the proposed site allocation policy, its supporting text and requirements of the adopted Development Management policies |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIN90 – Extension to Norton Subcourse Quarry, Loddon Road</th>
<th>England to reduce impact on nearby “designated sites” of biodiversity value.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledges site close to top of a ridge running to Nogdam End, views from parts of Low Road and a public right of way and the need for screening scheme re these views and longer distance views from the Broads Authority area. However is also adjacent to an active pit and has had part planning permission but is a dormant site under 1995 Environment Act. Concludes acceptable subject to conditions including: - to ensure use of the existing off-highway haul route, - extraction limited to current rates - an approved scheme of working and restoration and close cooperation with the Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership on scientific study on the site - noise and dust assessments re impacts on nearby properties and designated sites plus mitigation to address impacts - hydrological impact assessment</td>
<td><strong>Hydrological (groundwater) impact assessments and appropriate mitigations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support provided the suggested conditions are provided for within the site specific policy for the allocation and subject to additional safeguards to limit any potential adverse visual impact of the site on the noted ridge and viewpoints referred to, and subject to the inclusion of details of the phasing of the site to follow that of sites MIN 83 and MIN 91 in view of its prominence near the ridge. Conditions considered by the County Council to be required to make the site acceptable should be included within the site specific policy and not left to the planning application or generic development control policies.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Allocated for sand and gravel subject to compliance with adopted Core Strategy and Development Management policies. Planning application to address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Screening scheme to mitigate views from Low Road, the public rights of way and surrounding roads - Use of haul road from existing processing plant - Maximum extraction volumes limited to current maximum rate - Mitigation of any amenity impacts including noise and dust and scheme of phased working and restoration - Opportunities for geodiversity assets studies and archaeological evaluation - Agreed lighting scheme and other mitigations in consultation with Natural England to reduce impact on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- opportunities for geodiversity assets studies and archaeological evaluation - Agreed lighting scheme and other mitigations in consultation with Natural England to reduce impact on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MIN91 – Extension to Norton Subcourse Quarry, Loddon Road. | Allocated  
Concludes acceptable subject to the use of the existing off haul route, conditions to limit the rate of extraction to current levels  
- an approved scheme of working and restoration and close cooperation with the Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership on scientific study on the site  
- a noise and dust assessment and hydrological impact assessment | Support provided that the suggested conditions are included within the site specific policy allocating the site. Conditions considered by the County Council to be required to make the site acceptable should be included within the planning application or generic development control policies. | Allocated for sand and gravel subject to compliance with adopted Core Strategy and Development Management policies. Planning application to address  
- Screening scheme to mitigate views from the nearby properties and surrounding roads  
- Use of haul road from existing processing plant  
- Maximum extraction volumes limited to current maximum rate  
- Mitigation of any amenity impacts including noise and dust and scheme of phased working and restoration  
- Opportunities for geodiversity assets studies and archaeological evaluation  
- Agreed lighting scheme and other mitigations in consultation with Natural England to reduce impact on nearby “designated sites” of biodiversity value.  
- Hydrological (groundwater) impact assessments and appropriate mitigations | The site is described as an extension to the existing Norton Subcourse Quarry. The policy provides for the previously identified requirements to be addressed by a planning application for extraction. The policy limits road access to the existing haul road and the cumulative levels of extraction to the maximum levels already permitted. Any proposals for extraction will need to be decided within the context of these known requirements and the provisions of the adopted Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies (M&WDMP) as referred to above under site MIN 79. A combination of the proposed site allocation policy, its supporting text and requirements of the adopted Development Management policies cover South Norfolk Council’s areas of concern. Conclude no objection. |
| MIN 118 – Land at Hall Farm, Stanfield Road, Wymondham | Not allocated | Support | Allocated for sand and gravel subject to compliance with adopted Core Strategy and Development Management policies. Planning application to address
- Screening scheme to mitigate views from the nearby properties, public rights of way and surrounding roads
- Mitigation of any amenity impacts including noise and dust and scheme of phased working and restoration
- Archaeological evaluation requirement
- Hydrological (groundwater) impact assessments and appropriate mitigations

This site was newly proposed at the 2011 consultation but not proposed for allocation, a position supported by South Norfolk Council. However it has been allocated to cover for the shortfall arising from the withdrawn Marlingford site and a reassessment of potential sand and gravel reserves on other proposed sites.

The County Council’s Pre-Submission Statement of Consultation shows that the concerns raised about this site during the 2011 consultation included potential impacts on an Internal Drainage Board-maintained watercourse, on Oxford Common through impacts on the River Tiffey, and ecological impacts.

The site proposer has since submitted an ecology survey, landscape report and indicative phasing and landscape schemes in response to the 2011 consultation.

The site access is proposed to use an internal route from extraction site to Bridge Road and Stanfield Road. The County Council proposes screening, bunding and significant tree planting to mitigate impacts on the landscape and two nearby... |
Any proposals for extraction will need to be decided within the context of the policy requirements and the provisions of the adopted Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies (M&WDMP) as referred to above under site MIN 79.

Other adopted Development Management policies relevant to the issues raised are Policy DM1 covering nature conservation impacts, DM3 covering groundwater and surface water and DM10 covering Transport.

A combination of the proposed site allocation policy, its supporting text and requirements of the adopted Development Management policies cover the areas of concern.

Conclude no objection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>County Council 2011 assessment (summarised)</th>
<th>South Norfolk Council response 2011</th>
<th>County Council Pre-Submission Policy Summary 2012</th>
<th>South Norfolk Council Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| WAS26 – Bergh Apton   | Not allocated                               | Object as events have moved on since this Council’s response of December 2009. While closure of this successful recycling site is not currently proposed, its continued operation is not guaranteed by the proposed application for renewal of the existing temporary planning permission in early 2012. Relatively close similar facilities in Suffolk have been closed, and the closure of this site would leave a significant gap in the provision of such facilities in South Norfolk. This council considers that the site should continue in operation and be allocated in the Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document, while the County Council should also address the issue of improvements to the site’s access. | Not allocated | Norfolk County Council continues to consider that the site is not suitable for allocation as a Household Waste Recycling Centre for the reasons stated before. The County Council has submitted a planning application reference 2012/0677/C for the retention of the existing household waste recycling centre at Welbeck Road on a permanent basis. This was considered as a consultee by South Norfolk Council (Third Wednesday Planning Committee) on 16 May 2012. The committee resolved to support the proposal for a period of no more than ten years subject to the County Council seeking an alternative site. The site serves a large area lacking alternative facilities and there is no guarantee that it will be retained. The site scores mainly neutral impacts in the County Council’s Waste Site Allocations Sustainability Appraisal, but positively with regard to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the promotion of sustainable use of minerals and waste resources, and the promotion of economic growth. The few
### WAS31 – Land at Costessey Transfer Station, Longwater Business Park, Costessey

**Allocated**

Current use is as Costessey Waste Transfer station (a materials recycling facility). Acknowledges site is part screened from north but potential for significant impact on the Tud valley from tall structures such as chimneys. Refers to the River Wensum SAC 1km away and the local CWS (Long Dale). Considers access good via Longwater interchange and refers to its proposed improvement programme.

A Task 2 Appropriate Assessment has been carried out. Task 2 conclusions include need for sealed drainage system and that waste management operations should exclude those producing nitrogen emissions. Concludes mitigations should ensure no likely effects on the River Wensum SAC.

Overall site conclusions are that proposer is interested in energy from waste but River Wensum SAC is not.

**Comment:** Notes that a Task 2 AA has been carried out and been reflected in the overall site conclusion.

Support subject to caveat: South Norfolk Council is concerned that the current use of this site could be transferred elsewhere, which could release site WAS 31 for a potential incinerator.

While noting the references to nitrogen from thermal treatment processes having an adverse impact on the Wensum SAC, the council’s view is that the policy should not provide for any variety of waste incinerator on this site. This is to avoid potential adverse impacts on nearby residential amenity from the output of the necessary chimneys, and to avoid potentially increasing adverse traffic impacts due to the need to export toxic residue and to import large quantities of waste from a widening area to ensure the plant’s viability, especially if the King’s Lynn proposed incinerator is permitted.

This council also notes that while A Task 2 Appropriate Assessment has been carried out. Task 2 conclusions include need for sealed drainage system and that waste management operations should exclude those producing nitrogen emissions. Concludes mitigations should ensure no likely effects on the River Wensum SAC. Overall site conclusions are that proposer is interested in energy from waste but River Wensum SAC is not.

**Site allocated for residual waste treatment (excluding thermal treatment) subject to compliance with adopted Core Strategy and Development Management policies. Planning application required to address:**

- Design and landscaping to minimize visual impact on Tud Valley and views to the north
- Mitigation of amenity impacts and control of noise, dust, odour and lighting
- Appropriate site design, engineering and operations including containment of waste management operations which could cause emissions to air to within a building, and measures to ensure no adverse effects on the River Wensum SAC (Special Area of Conservation) and other protected habitats nearby from water run-off and emissions to the air.

While the proposed policy does not make specific provisions for what should not be located on the site such as a waste incinerator, the policy supporting text states that waste management operations should exclude those which could lead to nitrogen emissions to ensure that there would be no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Wensum SAC.

The policy excludes “thermal treatment”, but the absence of differentiation between alternative forms of thermal treatment that could be less controversial does not appear to be to the disadvantage of the locality or South Norfolk Council.

Overall the policy appears to preclude provisions for a waste incinerator on the site and provide for the concerns raised in the County Council’s 2011 assessment. Conclude no objection.

**negative impacts refer to visual intrusion and landscape impact.**

Despite the few sensitivities, the site is an important site and its loss if neither permitted nor allocated would result in the negative environmental impacts of extra travel and the potential dumping of rubbish in the countryside.

Conclude raise an objection to the non-allocation of the site on the basis of the proposal not being justified.
Allocated (for processing of recyclables, inert waste recycling)
Acknowledges partly visible form housing to north but suitable with enhanced woodland screening to north and structure height limitations.

Refers to the River Wensum SAC 1km away and the local CWS (Long Dale). Considers access good via Longwater interchange and refers to its proposed improvement programme.

Considerable reduction in the size of the site from 5.4 to 0.4 hectares.

A Task 2 Appropriate Assessment was carried out and provided drainage water from the site is contained and dust and traffic are

Comment: Notes that a Task 2 AA has been carried out and reflected in the overall site conclusion.
Support the reduced site subject to caveat: The Council is concerned that as there are already two materials recycling facilities in Costessey which could be more than adequate to take the recycling materials from Norwich, the viability of this site could be adversely affected, suggesting that an alternative but related use might be more appropriate.

All appropriate development provided for should also be subject to specific conditions within the site allocations policy based on those referred to by the County Council’s assessment, and which should not be dependent solely upon the planning application.

Site allocated for the processing of recyclables and/or inert waste recycling subject to compliance with adopted Core Strategy and Development Management policies. Planning application required to address:
- operations limited to sorting, shredding, baling, storage and transfer only
- design and landscaping to minimize visual impact on Tud Valley and views to the north
- buffer zone to protect woodland to north of site
- mitigation of amenity impacts and control of noise, dust, odour and lighting
- appropriate site design,

The proposed policy provisions address the concerns of South Norfolk Council. The remaining concerns regarding the potential viability of the site were an expression of local member concerns and would not form the basis for an objection to the soundness of the plan.
Conclude no objection
suitably controlled, concluded there should be no likely impacts to the River Wensum SAC.

Overall concludes site reduced substantially; suitable for proposed uses subject to “inert waste recycling” and “processing of recyclables” being limited to “sorting, shredding, bailing, storage and transfer”; screening required from north across Tud valley; protection of amenity (by control of noise, dust, odour, lighting) and protection of ground water; ecological requirements and highway requirements including contributions to Longwater interchange.

Such conditions should include
- the use of the site being limited to “inert waste recycling” and “the processing of recyclables”
- uses limited to “sorting, shredding, bailing, storage and transfer”;
- the screening of the site from north across Tud valley
- the protection of amenity (by control of noise, dust, odour, lighting) and protection of ground water;
- ecological requirements to include the containment of drainage from the site, and
- highway requirements including contributions to the Longwater interchange
- engineering and operations to ensure no adverse effects on the River Wensum SAC (Special Area of Conservation) and other protected habitats nearby from water run-off and emissions to the air.
- developer contributions to improvement of the Longwater interchange

WAS33 – Tivetshall St. Margaret
Allocated (for a household waste recycling centre)
Subject to the consideration of landscaping screening; protection of amenity by control of noise, dust odour and lighting; ecological requirements; protection of groundwater and site specific flood risk assessment.

Support subject to the inclusion within the site specific policy of the conditions considered necessary based on those referred to by the County Council’s assessment, which should not be dependent solely upon the planning application.

The site is allocated for a household waste recycling centre subject to compliance with adopted Core Strategy and Development Management policies. Planning application required to address:
- landscaping to maintain screening with particular regard to any new structures, lighting, or any required vehicle access and circulation arrangements
- mitigation of amenity impacts and control of noise, dust, odour and

Flood risk assessment shows that the site is in Flood Zone 1. The policy provides for the considerations referred to in 2011. Conclude no objection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>lighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- appropriate design and engineering to protect aquifer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommended responses to the publication of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework:

Separate response forms are required by Norfolk County Council for the following two development plan documents. The responses below are tailored to fit the information required on the forms.

a) Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD Pre-Submission:
No further comment required.

b) Waste Site Specific Allocations DPD Pre-Submission:
Part B
2. To which part of the DPD does this representation relate?
No particular paragraph but the lack of provision for a required waste site at Bergh Apton.

3. Do you consider the DPD is:
   i) Legally compliant – YES
   ii) Sound – NO

4. Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not
   i) Justified – YES

5. Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound.
   I consider the DPD to be unsound due to its lack of provision for a household waste recycling centre at Bergh Apton (as identified by Revised Further Issues and Options Consultation site ref: WAS26).

The County Council has submitted a planning application reference 2012/0677/C for the retention of the existing household waste recycling centre at Welbeck Road on a permanent basis. This was considered as a consultee by South Norfolk Council (Third Wednesday Planning Committee) on 16 May 2012. South Norfolk Council resolved to support the proposal for a period of no more than ten years subject to the County Council seeking an alternative site.

The site serves a large area lacking alternative facilities and there is no guarantee that it will be retained as a result of the application for renewal of the existing temporary planning permission. The site scores mainly neutral impacts in the County Council’s Waste Site Allocations Sustainability Appraisal, but positively with regard to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the promotion of sustainable use of minerals and waste resources, and the promotion of economic growth. The few negative impacts refer to visual intrusion and landscape impact.
Despite the few sensitivities, the site is an important site and its loss if neither permitted nor allocated would result in the negative environmental impacts of extra travel and the potential dumping of rubbish in the countryside.

6. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, with reference to the answer... at 4 above ....... The change required is for the allocation of a household waste recycling centre at Bergh Apton (as identified by Revised Further Issues and Options Consultation site ref: WAS26) to be continued for a period of no more than ten years.

7. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?
No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination.

8. If you wish to participate in the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.
Not applicable
Cabinet Policy Committees – Future Work Programme

Compliance and Risk Manager

On 21 May 2012, Council approved a new Committee structure for South Norfolk Council. This structure introduced Cabinet Policy Committees, under the Chairmanship of the Deputy Cabinet Members, whose role is primarily to support the development of policy and perform in-depth review of Council performance.

The terms of reference for the Policy Committees make clear that it is for Cabinet to direct the work of the Committees. This report sets out an initial work programme for the Policy Committees over the forthcoming year, for Cabinet to then review and approve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cabinet member(s):</th>
<th>Ward(s) affected:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Fuller</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail: Leah Mickleborough 01508 533954 lmickleborough@s-norfolk.gov.uk

1. **Background**

1.1. Members may wish to refer to the Council agenda for 21 May, 2012, item 12, for detail on the purpose and establishment of the Cabinet Policy Committees. Appendix 1 to that report provides the revised Committee structure for the Council.

1.2. The new terms of reference for Cabinet include that it will form a work programme of policy development areas for the Policy Committee, whilst the terms of reference for the Policy Committee indicate that their work will be directed by Cabinet.

1.3. The work of the Policy Committees will not be completely driven by the development of policies. There will be capacity throughout the year for Cabinet to refer specific issues to the Committees, e.g. where performance information presented to Cabinet highlights areas not performing as expected, the relevant Policy Committee may be discharged to then look into these areas in more detail. As such, the work programme for each Committee will continue to evolve throughout the year.
2. Current Position and Issues

2.1. In developing the suggested work programmes for the policy committees, officers have drawn on various sources.

2.2. Firstly, within the Council report, it was recognised that at present policy development work is undertaken through various means. In particular, some policy development work has previously been undertaken by the overview sub-committees. The work programmes for the former overview sub-committees have been removed and work transferred to the Policy Committees, where relevant.

2.3. Secondly, the Directorate Plans, 2012-13, identify the key strategies within Directorates, and their proposed dates of review. The timing for these reviews have been discussed with managers and directors, and incorporated into the work programmes.

2.4. Third, due regard has been paid to ongoing developments both nationally and within the Council, such as the Community Empowerment Scheme.

2.5. The key area removed from the work programme is partnership reviews. These have traditionally been undertaken by Scrutiny, or the overview sub-committees on a rolling basis. In future, it is intended to assess partnerships as part of the policy formation process, through assessing how partnerships can support delivery of services when reviewing overall policy and strategy.

3. Proposal and Reasons

3.1. The proposed work programmes are attached at Appendix 1.

3.2. Following Cabinet approval, it is intended that Policy Committees will meet in July to review the work programme, and determine the timing and frequency of meeting in order to deliver the work required. The work programmes of each Policy Committee will then be incorporated into the Cabinet Forward Plan, with updates provided on how Policy Committees are progressing in delivering their work programme.

3.3. It is intended that a separate cross-cutting cabinet task and finish group will be formed in order to review the future of the Council’s leisure service (following a report on management options for the leisure centres presented to the Localism and Neighbourhoods Overview Sub-Committee). The need for the separate panel is driven by the range of different services involved, e.g. finance, human resources and the leisure service itself.

3.4. In addition, we have developed a “working style” document similar to that which has been successfully employed for the Scrutiny Committee (and formerly to the Overview Sub-Committees). This should help to establish a consistent working pattern across the Policy Committees, and ensure there is clarity for officers and members on what to expect from the Policy Committees. The working style for Policy Committees has been attached at Appendix 2.
4. Other Options

4.1. None

5. Implications and Risks

5.1. None

6. Conclusion

6.1. The work programmes of the Cabinet Policy Committees are established by Cabinet. This report sets out suggested work programmes based on review of the previous Overview Sub-Committee work programmes, Directorate Plans and known events within the Council.

7. Recommendations

7.1. Cabinet is requested to review the work programmes attached at Appendix 1, and make any modifications as necessary.

7.2. Cabinet is recommended to approve the working style for policy committee document at Appendix 2.
Localism Committee

This Committee will oversee the work of the Neighbourhood Boards, as well as assessing other areas of activity falling previously under the remit of the Localism and Neighbourhoods Overview Sub-Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy / Area</th>
<th>Specific Role</th>
<th>Expected Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Empowerment Scheme</td>
<td>Reviewing how the community empowerment scheme is operating across the District Assessing the operation of the scheme and using this to develop policy in future years</td>
<td>Throughout the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety Partnership Plan</td>
<td>Develop the Community Safety Partnership Plan</td>
<td>By November 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finance, Resources, Accounts and Governance Committee

In the short term, this Committee will need to undertake a number of key document reviews that would have been scheduled for the Accounts, Audit and Governance Committee.

In order for the Committee to input to the draft statement of accounts before the deadline for approval by the Financial Services Manager, the Committee will need to meet before the end of June, and therefore it is expected this Committee will meet on 28 June 2012, when the Accounts, Audit and Governance Committee would have been expected to meet.

As such, this Committee, in line with its terms of reference, will have a scheme of general policy reviews and implementation, and a specific work programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy / Area</th>
<th>Specific Role</th>
<th>Expected Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| External Audit| • Oversight of the Council’s new external auditor  
• Ensuring Council has appropriate arrangements to comply with new legislation  
• Review of external audit’s annual report | Ongoing throughout year  
September 2012 |
| HR policies   | The Council is reviewing a number of HR policies. This role will be discharged through the Joint Consultative Committee. | Ongoing throughout year  |
| Strategic Financial Management | • Medium Term Financial Plan | July 2012 |
|                               | • Treasury Management Strategy | February 2013 |
|                               | • Draft Statement of Accounts | June 2012 |
|                               | • Final Statement of Accounts | September 2012 |
|                               | • Capital Strategy | December 2012 |

| Internal Audit Strategy (applies to SNC and CNC) | • Internal Audit Plans and Strategy | February 2013 |
|                                                | • Effectiveness review of internal audit | June 2012 |
|                                                | • Annual Report of Internal Audit | June 2012 |

| Governance arrangements | Annual Governance Statement | September 2012 |

| Risk Management Strategy | Develop updated risk management strategy | September 2012 |

**Environment, Growth and Regulation Committee**

This committee will take forward those strategies identified in the Development and Environment Directorate Plan, in addition to focusing on areas that may previously have been the domain of the Public Protection and Environment Overview Sub-Committee. Strategic Planning will continue to be reviewed by the Local Planning Steering Group until at least September 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy / Area</th>
<th>Specific Role</th>
<th>Expected Timing (TBC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Develop policy to maximise business growth</td>
<td>By March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Continuity Strategy</td>
<td>Develop the business continuity policy</td>
<td>Nov 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Input to the Norfolk Emergency Response and Recovery Strategy</td>
<td>Nov 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Strategy</td>
<td>Develop the environment strategy</td>
<td>By March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management Strategy</td>
<td>Develop the waste management strategy</td>
<td>By March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Waste Management</td>
<td>Input to development of potential food waste scheme in South Norfolk</td>
<td>By March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Guide</td>
<td>Per Local Plans Steering Group</td>
<td>September 2012 (post September 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td>Per Local Plans Steering Group</td>
<td>September 2012 (post September 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Management Strategy</td>
<td>Develop proposals for the introduction of pre-application advice criteria</td>
<td>By March 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work to continue to develop the planning scheme of delegation to improve the effectiveness of the development management service

**Housing and Public Health Committee**

This Committee will take forward those strategies identified in the Communities Directorate Plan, in addition to focusing on some areas that were previously subject to review in the Localism and Neighbourhoods Overview Sub-Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy / Area</th>
<th>Specific Role</th>
<th>Expected Timing (TBC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk Housing Strategy</td>
<td>Develop the housing strategy</td>
<td>To November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Housing Tenure Reform</td>
<td>Development of the Tenancy Strategy</td>
<td>By November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues and Benefits Strategy</td>
<td>Work in an integrated manner with the Council Tax Support and Business Rates working group to develop strategies to deliver the national business rates / benefits agenda (e.g. develop the Council’s approach to the proposed Universal Credit Pilot)</td>
<td>To March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Management Advice</td>
<td>Develop Council policies towards providing debt management advice to residents (including work with partnership bodies to deliver advice)</td>
<td>To December 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cross-Cutting Policies**

These will require consideration by either Cabinet directly or by a policy committee/ Cabinet task and finish group. This will be assessed as they evolve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-cutting Policy Development</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Centres</td>
<td>Consider and recommend preferred option for future management arrangements</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Strategy</td>
<td>Develop strategy to ensure Organisational Change &amp; Innovation supported</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Working Style of Cabinet Policy Committees

Member Leadership

Members of the Committees will take the lead in understanding the direction provided by Cabinet and delivering work to Cabinet requirements. Whilst recognising political allegiances, members will work in a collaborative manner with officers and cabinet portfolio holders to consider the relevant issues when developing Council policy.

Collaborative Working

All meetings of the Committees will be constructive and conducted in a spirit of mutual respect and trust. Officers will commit to supplying meetings with information relevant to making informed decisions on policies and matters. Members will commit to thoroughly reading and understanding papers, raising questions that are pertinent to the issues at stake. Members will, where feasible, agree definable actions to be taken forward by officers to develop policy, rather than having items for noting or simply to discuss.

Frequency and Nature of Meeting

Each Committee will have at least 3 formal, public meetings per year. In assessing items delegated by Cabinet for review, the Committee may decide that it wishes to meet on a more or less frequent basis.

The Committee may also hold informal meetings should it require in order to progress specific items in detail. However, if the Committee is meeting to determine whether to refer items for Cabinet approval, the meeting should follow the Council’s Standing Orders and thus be subject to a formal agenda, be held in public and the meeting recorded.

Informal meetings may be held in any manner suitable for conducting business (e.g. via meeting, conference call, circulation of information via e-mail, or site visits); while relevant information will be supplied by officers where appropriate, these meetings will not be subject to a formal agenda or minutes. Where business of the Committee is undertaken through informal meeting, all members of the Committee will be provided opportunity to participate.

Training

Members commit to undertaking development – for example, attending formal training sessions, or reading relevant background material, in order to properly equip themselves to deliver their expected role fully.

Accountability
The Policy Committees will be accountable to Cabinet. They will not be able to make decisions themselves, but can recommend decisions to Cabinet. Cabinet may review whether the Committees are discharging their duties effectively, and may receive progress reports on how the Policy Committee is working to discharge its duties.

**Work Programmes**

The Work Programmes for the Policy Committee will be established by Cabinet. Members of the Committee will not be able to raise items to be included in the work programme. Where topics have been identified for inclusion in the work programme, the Committee will work to identify how it will discharge its responsibilities, including the resources required to do so.

**Managing Time**

However the Committee is meeting, it will attempt to conclude the business of each meeting in reasonable time. The Chairman will be responsible for ensuring the meeting stays focused on pertinent issues, and does not become side-tracked on issues that are not relevant to the policy under consideration, or those that should be discussed by a separate committee.