

Settlement Name:	Easton and Honingham
Settlement Hierarchy:	<p>Easton is identified as an urban fringe settlement in the Greater Norwich Local Plan. There is a major growth allocation, with outline planning permission for development of 893 homes on land to the east, south and west of the village. Proposals include an extended primary school, a new village hall, a small retail store and areas of public open space. Around Easton, defining features are the Royal Norfolk Showground to the east of the village (within Costessey parish), the A47 Southern Bypass that runs to the north of the main built up area, and Easton College to the south. The high-quality sports facilities at the college are conveniently accessible for Easton residents, as are the employment opportunities, retail and leisure facilities at Longwater.</p> <p>Easton Neighbourhood Plan was made in December 2017 and covers the period to 2042. It contains a series of policies that look to shape development within the neighbourhood area. There are policies within the plan that will be of relevance to development and any applications that are submitted for development within the parish should have due regard to those policies.</p> <p>Honingham is a small village immediately south of the A47 Southern Bypass in Broadland district. The River Tud flows through the village and consequently some areas are at fluvial and surface water flood risk. The majority of Honingham parish is rural, but the designation of a Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) for businesses focused upon food processing and production should be noted. Currently 19 hectares of the FEZ, with a net developable area of approximately 16.5 hectares, benefits from Local Development Order (LDO) status promoting commercial development land on this site in units of varying scale.</p> <p>Easton is located in the south-west sector of the urban fringe along with Costessey, Cringleford, Hethersett and Little Melton. Early work for the 'Towards a Strategy' document gives an indicative new allocation figure of 600 dwellings across all these settlements, particularly identifying scope for uplift within the existing allocation. The potential of a new settlement at Honingham is also mentioned. This site assessment booklet looks in detail at the sites promoted in Easton to determine which are the most suitable to contribute towards the overall allocation figure for the south west urban fringe sector. Any sites preferred for allocation in Honingham will be counted towards the total for Broadland village clusters.</p>

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

STAGE 1 – COMPLETE LIST OF SITES PROMOTED IN THE SETTLEMENT

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

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Proposal
Easton			
Land off A47	GNLP0456	9.12	Approx. 25 dwellings
Honingham			
Land at Fellows Road	GNLP0411	0.72	Approx. 13 dwellings
Honingham Thorpe	GNLP0415R - D	85.53	Residential (Unspecified Number)
Honingham Thorpe	GNLP0415R - G	10.65	Residential (Unspecified Number)
Honingham Thorpe	GNLP0415 – A - G	360.96	Strategic mixed use development consisting of: GNLP0415-A – residential development 113.12ha; GNLP0415-B – employment 14.37ha; GNLP0415-C – employment 53.87ha; GNLP0415-; GNLP0415-E – country park 81.56ha; and GNLP0415-F – nature reserve 3.5 ha
North of Dereham Road	GNLP2176	3.74	55 dwellings
Total area of land		470.72	

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

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Proposal
None			

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

LIST OF SITES SUBMITTED FOR OTHER USES

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Proposal
Bawburgh, Costessey and Easton			
Norfolk Showground (Partly in Costessey, Easton and Bawburgh parishes)	GNLP2074	76.66	Food ,farming, leisure, tourism, recreation, arts, exhibition

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

STAGE 2 – HELAA COMPARISON TABLE

RESIDENTIAL/MIXED USE

	Categories													
	Site access	Access to services	Utilities Capacity	Utilities Infrastructure	Contamination/ ground stability	Flood Risk	Market attractiveness	Significant landscapes	Sensitive townscapes	Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Historic environment	Open Space and GI	Transport & Roads	Compatibility with neighbouring uses
Site Reference														
Easton														
GNLP0456	Amber	Red	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Amber
Honingham														
GNLP0411	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP0415 - A	Green	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP0415R - D	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP0415R - G	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP2176	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green

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

Site Reference	Comments
Easton	
GNLP0456	<p>Norfolk Geodiversity Partnership comments We conditionally object to this site proposal. We note that it includes a gravel pit of geological interest, listed in the Norfolk Geodiversity Audit as site SNF37. It is a notable exposure of the 'cannon-shot' gravels composing the Westlodge Hills and other parts of the Ringland Hills outwash plain system, dating from the Anglian glaciation (Straw, 1973). If development were granted on this site we request that plans be made conditional upon providing adequate geological exposures of the 'cannon-shot' gravels, as part of a nature conservation area for green infrastructure, to conserve the site's geological as well as wildlife interest.</p>
Honingham	
GNLP0411	<p>General comments Impacts on the CWS can be avoided by becoming green space in a larger development and plans would need to include a buffer zone. 0415 should not be allocated. 0411 is a haven for wildlife and the development would spoil the character and views of the village.</p> <p>The site is in a flood plain of the River Tud valley and Mill Lane frequently floods and is bounded by a water meadow. There is natural drainage here into the Tud and this process will be adversely affected. Habitat loss will not be replaced.</p> <p>The access road is very narrow and unsuitable for this site. Mill Lane is single track and widening it would mean taking gardens away from seven properties. Increased traffic would become a risk. Access from Fellowes Road would create further problems as most residents park on the road. Improving permeability is not an important point.</p> <p>The proposal will change the character of the village and remove the charm, wildlife and peace of the village. Wildlife will be detrimentally affected as there are many birds that live in the area. The development will negatively impact historical beauty and community spirit.</p> <p>There are no shops, schools or facilities so a development of this size would not be appropriate. Access is inappropriate and there are also flooding issues.</p>
GNLP0415R - D	General comments

	<p>one comment in support of site submitted a flood risk & drainage feasibility study, Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report, Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, initial design market square analysis and phase 1 – transport strategy.</p> <p>Objections raised concerns regarding boundary changes make no difference to the proposed development. Additional housing of the magnitude proposed would add significantly to pressure on our roads, drainage, utilities, medical and education services. No shop, post office or doctors surgery and infrequent and unreliable bus service causing many car movements, existing surface water flooding which would worsen with more housing</p> <p>Inappropriate development on agricultural land that will transform a rural area. When added to the continuing development of Easton it turns the entire area into a suburb of Norwich, one continuous ribbon development along the A47.</p> <p>Breckland District Council comments It is difficult at this stage to appreciate the potential impact of any one site put forward in this subsequent consultation, without a firm understanding of the GNDP overall strategy for growth. A new settlement bordering Breckland District could have a substantial impact. Breckland seek to work with the GNDP on potential growth options.</p> <p>Marlingford and Colton Parish Council comments The Parish Council is gravely concerned at the prospect of such a large development so close to Marlingford & Colton. In addition to the loss of higher-grade agricultural land, such a large development in addition to the huge Food Enterprise industrial estate and massive growth of Easton would completely transform a rural area into a suburban one with a serious negative impact upon Marlingford and Colton, as well as adding to the practically continuous ribbon development along the A47 corridor west of Norwich.</p> <p>Honingham Parish Council comments Honingham Parish Council object to this site and do not believe it is the right location for such a large new settlement. It will have a detrimental effect on the current village, threatening its character. There are considerable threats to the local environment and there are not sufficient services to support such a large-scale development.</p>
GNLP0415R - G	General comments

	<p>one comment in support of site submitted a flood risk & drainage feasibility study, Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report, Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, Initial design market square analysis and phase 1 – transport strategy.</p> <p>Objections raised concerns regarding creation of an urban sprawl, environment issue, drainage and scale of development. Boundary change does not make a difference. Comments still stand from original stage A site submitted.</p> <p>Honingham Parish Council comments Honingham Parish Council object to this site and do not believe it is the right location for such a large new settlement. It will have a detrimental effect on the current village, threatening its character. There are considerable threats to the local environment and there are not sufficient services to support such a large scale development.</p>
GNLP0415 A-G	<p>General comments This site will continue the ribbon development along the A47 and is below NCC's guidelines for settlement sustainability as there is no rail station. The site will put pressure on for a Wensum valley link road which will destroy the landscape. This proposal does not take into account the dualling of the A47. The dualling only improves access on and off the road. A11 corridor is more suitable for development. The village would become a rat run for the cars avoiding the A47. Prevent urban sprawl of Norwich. The A47 should be the boundary of development. Carbon emissions will significantly increase from this development. Infrastructural problems on the time expired roundabout at Longwater also raising emissions. Traffic will make walking in Marlingford very dangerous as there are no paths. For the people unable to drive and disabled, walking in the quiet countryside is very important.</p> <p>There is a very strong appreciation of wildlife and the local environment and the site would cause a loss of visual amenity, increased traffic, noise, and light pollution. Traffic will spoil wildlife habitats and will remove equestrian and dog route. Water run-off will go into the river valley where there are already problems. The Barford flood defence system would be jeopardised and would increase flooding of the highway/residential areas. Grange Wood is a Conservation Area. Impacts on CWS and river valley can be avoided by becoming green space; however, it would be best if this site was not allocated.</p> <p>These sites would create a new settlement and it is not clear how the proposal would work together with the food hub.</p>

	<p>The roads cannot cope with the traffic already, so more traffic would be detrimental. The Food Hub should be the only development.</p> <p>The vision is based on a holistic approach by delivering a sustainable community predicated on employment, residential and leisure elements. The proposal includes 72 hectares of employment space, 198 hectares of residential development, 81 hectares of Country Park and 3.5 hectares of nature reserve.</p> <p>Historic England comments The effect on locally designated heritage assets should be considered. The impact on undiscovered archaeological interest should be considered. There should be recognition of the need to identify constraints and opportunities.</p>
GNLP2176	<p>General comments Two comments in support of site. Suggestions made the site is suitable, available, achievable and viable, and is deliverable within the first five years of the Greater Norwich Local Plan period. Documents submitted: Flood Risk and Drainage Feasibility Study, Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report, Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, Initial design market square analysis and Phase 1 – Transport Strategy.</p> <p>One comment in support of site suggests the site will bring more people in to use local businesses and suggests they would need a bus service and a maybe a new shop and post office. The only thing is the drawings show no area allowance for existing overflow village hall car park arrangements up to the newly erected fence, as agreed with the landowner.</p> <p>Objections raised concerns regarding preservation of rural Norfolk, flood risk, facilities being able to cope, loss of agricultural land, scale of development, lack of public transport, traffic congestion, road safety and loss of habitats for animals. It is suggested the site would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the village. The village has no shop, post office, school, doctors and certainly no bus service.</p> <p>Honingham Parish Council comments Honingham Parish Council object to this site as being wholly unsuitable and inappropriate for a village of this size. This is not a suitable location for such a large number of houses. The services indicated in the report as making this site</p>

	<p>suitable are inaccurate. It will have a detrimental effect on the current village, threatening its character. The impact on the village of Honingham would be significant and the parish council object to this proposal.</p>
--	--

STAGE 4 – DISCUSSION OF SUBMITTED SITES

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

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

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

Sites considered to be reasonable alternatives:

GNLP0415

This is a proposed new settlement and is considered to be a reasonable alternative due to its identification as an alternative/contingency site in the ‘Towards a Strategy’ document.

Comments received relate to lack of services and facilities in the area, continued urbanisation of the area (as Easton is set to grow) and therefore changing the character of the area. Further comments raise links with the Food Hub and raise concern about access onto the A47 and the area being used as a rat run for those wishing not to use the A47. These are noted and will form part of the detailed site assessment.

It would be of a scale to provide facilities on site including a primary school. As such this is shortlisted for further assessment. The following provides some information about each segment of 0415. Note some particular considerations in the list below of

grade 2 agricultural land, small patches of surface water flood risk and some listed buildings nearby.

- GNLP0415 – A - Central bands are affected by surface water flood risk. Away from a settlement boundary. Grade 3 agricultural land. Some listed buildings nearby. Northern part over the road from CWS.
- GNLP0415 – B - Band of surface water flood risk through eastern part of site. Away from a settlement boundary. Grade 3 agricultural land.
- GNLP0415 – C - Small patches of surface water flood risk. Eastern part adjacent to a settlement boundary. Grade 3 agricultural land. There are overhead cables across the site and a historic landfill within it, with the potential for contamination or land instability.
- GNLP0415R – D - Small patches of surface water flood risk. Away from a settlement boundary. Grade 2 agricultural land. Partially within Marlingford & Colton parish
- GNLP0415R – G - Does not seem to be affected by surface water flood risk. Away from a settlement boundary. Grade 3 agricultural land.

GNLP2176

This site is located in Honingham village. It is noted that if the 0415 sites come forward as a new settlement then a new school would be closer to this site, but there is no footway for the entire route along Norwich Road and it does not seem feasible and viable for one to be provided through development. However, although the site is nearly 4km from the primary school in Easton with no safe route to school it is considered to be a reasonable alternative at this stage as it may be possible to re-route the school bus.

Sites not considered to be reasonable alternatives:

GNLP0411

This site is located in Honingham village. It is not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it does not appear feasible to create an access and the site is nearly 4km from the primary school in Easton with no safe route to school. It is noted that if the 0415 sites come forward as a new settlement then a new school would be closer to this site, but there is no footway for the entire route along Norwich Road and it does not seem feasible and viable for one to be provided through development. Although it may be possible to re-route the school bus, the problems achieving a suitable site access make the site unreasonable.

GNLP0456

This site is not considered to be a reasonable alternative due to its location on the opposite side of the A47 to the main part of Easton village. The HELAA assessment indicated that there is no possibility of creating a suitable access and there is no safe route to the primary school in Easton. Small patches of the site are at surface water flood risk, it borders a County Wildlife Site and the site includes a gravel pit of geological interest, listed in the Norfolk Geodiversity Audit as site SNF37. Norfolk

Geodiversity Partnership request that if development were granted on this site plans should be made conditional upon providing adequate geological exposures.

STAGE 5 – SHORTLIST OF REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE SITES FOR FURTHER ASSESSMENT

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

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Proposal
Honingham			
Honingham Thorpe	GNLP0415R - D	85.53	Residential (Unspecified Number)
Honingham Thorpe	GNLP0415R - G	10.65	Residential (Unspecified Number)
Honingham Thorpe	GNLP0415 – A-C & E-F	266.12	Strategic mixed use development consisting of: GNLP0415-A – residential development 113.12ha; GNLP0415-B – employment 14.37ha; GNLP0415-C – employment 53.87ha; GNLP0415-E – country park 81.56ha; and GNLP0415-F – nature reserve 3.5 ha
North of Dereham Road, Honingham	GNLP2176	3.74	55 Dwellings
Total area of land		362.30	

STAGE 6 – DETAILED SITE ASSESSMENTS OF REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE SITES

Site Reference:	GNLP0415R – D
Address:	Honingham Thorpe
Proposal:	Housing, as part of a strategic mixed use development consisting of commercial and residential areas, incorporating district centres composed of retail, community facilities, primary schools, open space, landscaping including wildlife corridors and country park/nature reserve, and associated infrastructure

CURRENT USE OF SITE:	BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:
Agricultural interspersed with woodland areas	Greenfield

CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA
Amber Constraints in HELAA Access, Accessibility to Services, Utilities Capacity, Flood Risk, Market Attractiveness, Significant Landscapes, Biodiversity & Geodiversity, Historic Environment and Transport & Roads.
HELAA Conclusion This site lies to the south of the A and C sites, is partially within Marlingford & Colton parish and is proposed for housing. A small part of the site boundary has been revised in the north-west and south-east corners. The site contains several areas at risk of surface water flooding, which could be avoided, and is in agricultural land class 2. Initial highway evidence has indicated that, as a strategic site, a suitable access could be achieved and any impact on local roads could be mitigated. There is limited access to existing services, but the site is proposed as part of a strategic development which would address this. It is likely that the water supply and sewerage network would need to be upgraded. There are no known constraints from utilities infrastructure. The site would not affect a designated landscape or townscape, or public open space. A number of constraints are identified but subject to being able to overcome these the site is considered suitable for housing use for the land availability assessment, although as the land has already been counted towards the figure in the original HELAA document it must not be double-counted for the purposes of this HELAA addendum and has therefore been marked as unsuitable.

FURTHER COMMENTS
Highways No comments
Development Management No comments

Minerals & Waste

Underlain or partially by S&G any future policy should include CS16 if allocated

Lead Local Flood Authority

Strategic housing expansion areas would need specific text to ensure that flood risk and strategic drainage infrastructure is provided at master-planning stage. No site-specific comments.

PLANNING HISTORY:

Not known

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION

- Flood Risk and Drainage Feasibility Study
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report
- Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment
- Initial Design Market Square Analysis
- Phase 1 Transport Strategy
- Utilities Plans

Site Reference:	GNLP0415R - G
Address:	Honingham Thorpe
Proposal:	Housing, as part of a strategic mixed use development consisting of commercial and residential areas, incorporating district centres composed of retail, community facilities, primary schools, open space, landscaping including wildlife corridors and country park/nature reserve, and associated infrastructure

CURRENT USE OF SITE:	BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:
Agricultural	Greenfield

CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA
<p>Amber Constraints in HELAA Access, Accessibility to Services, Utilities Capacity, Market Attractiveness, Historic Environment and Transport & Roads.</p>
<p>HELAA Conclusion This site lies to the west of the A site along Mattishall Road and is proposed for housing. The southern boundary of the site has been revised. The site contains a narrow tree belt, so an ecological survey would be required. The site's lack of access to existing services (other than local employment and bus) would need to be addressed by their provision on this or adjacent sites. Initial highway evidence has indicated that, as a strategic site, a suitable access could be achieved and any impact on local roads could be mitigated. It is likely that the water supply and sewerage network would need to be upgraded. There are no known constraints from utilities infrastructure, contamination or land instability, and the site is not at risk of flooding. There are listed buildings nearby, but no sensitive landscapes or townscapes would be affected, and there would be no loss of public open space. A number of constraints are identified but subject to being able to overcome these the site is considered suitable for the land availability assessment, although as the land has already been counted towards the figure in the original HELAA document it must not be double counted for the purposes of this HELAA addendum and has therefore been marked as unsuitable.</p>

FURTHER COMMENTS
<p>Highways No comments</p> <p>Development Management No comments</p> <p>Minerals & Waste</p>

No comments

Lead Local Flood Authority

Strategic housing expansion areas would need specific text to ensure that flood risk and strategic drainage infrastructure is provided at master-planning stage. No site-specific comments.

PLANNING HISTORY:

Not known

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION

- Flood Risk and Drainage Feasibility Study
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report
- Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment
- Initial Design Market Square Analysis
- Phase 1 Transport Strategy
- Utilities Plans

Site Reference:	GNLP0415A
Address:	Honingham Thorpe - Site A
Proposal:	Strategic mixed use development (AG)consisting of residential development, employment, country park , nature reserve

CURRENT USE OF SITE:	BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:
Agricultural interspersed with woodland	Greenfield

CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA
<p>Amber Constraints in HELAA Accessibility to Services, Utilities Capacity, Flood Risk, Market Attractiveness, Significant Landscapes, Biodiversity & Geodiversity, Historic Environment and Transport & Roads.</p>
<p>HELAA Conclusion This very large site is not connected to the village but runs south of Mattishall Road and the A47, and is proposed for residential use as part of a proposed new settlement. The site's lack of access to existing services would need to be addressed by their provision on this or adjacent sites. The site contains some pockets of woodland, so an ecological survey would be required. Initial highway evidence has indicated that a suitable access could be achieved and any impact on local roads could be mitigated. It is likely that the water supply and sewerage network would need to be upgraded. There are no known constraints from utilities infrastructure, but there is a historic landfill within the site, with the potential for contamination or land instability. There are some areas at risk of flooding, but these could be avoided. Approximately 15% of the site is on grade 2 agricultural land and there are listed buildings nearby, but no sensitive landscapes or townscapes would be affected. A number of constraints are identified but subject to being able to overcome these the site is considered suitable for the land availability assessment.</p>

FURTHER COMMENTS
<p>Highways No Highways comments</p> <p>Development Management No comments</p> <p>Minerals & Waste Underlain or partially by S&G any future policy matters should include CS16 if allocated</p> <p>Lead Local Flood Authority</p>

Strategic housing expansion areas would need specific text to ensure that flood risk and strategic drainage infrastructure is provided at master-planning stage. No site-specific comments.

PLANNING HISTORY:

Not known

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION

- Vision Statement
- Concepts
- Red Line Plan

Site Reference:	GNLP0415B
Address:	Honingham Thorpe - Site B
Proposal:	Strategic mixed use development (AG)consisting of residential development, employment, country park , nature reserve

CURRENT USE OF SITE:	BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:
Agricultural intersperse with woodland	Greenfield

CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA
<p>Amber Constraints in HELAA Access, Utilities Capacity, Contamination and Ground Stability, Flood Risk, Market Attractiveness, Historic Environment and Transport & Roads.</p> <p>Red Constraints in HELAA Accessibility to Services</p>
<p>HELAA Conclusion This site lies to the south of the A site and is proposed for employment serving a potential workforce living on the A site. There are currently no services nearby but this could be addressed by provision on the adjacent site. There are some areas within the site at risk of surface water flooding, but these could be avoided. Initial highway evidence has indicated that a suitable access could be achieved and any impact on local roads could be mitigated. It is likely that the water supply and sewerage network would need to be upgraded. There are no known constraints from utilities infrastructure but there is a historic landfill within the site, with the potential for contamination or land instability. The site contains some pockets of woodland, but would not affect a designated landscape or townscape, or public open space. A number of constraints are identified, particularly the lack of accessibility to services but as this could be mitigated through the provision of services on adjacent land the site is considered suitable for employment use for the land availability assessment.</p>

FURTHER COMMENTS
<p>Highways No Highways comments</p> <p>Development Management No comments</p> <p>Minerals & Waste No comments</p> <p>Lead Local Flood Authority</p>

Strategic housing expansion areas would need specific text to ensure that flood risk and strategic drainage infrastructure is provided at master-planning stage. No site-specific comments.

PLANNING HISTORY:

Not known

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION

- Vision Statement
- Concepts
- Red Line Plan

Site Reference:	GNLP0415C
Address:	Honingham Thorpe - Site C
Proposal:	Strategic mixed use development (AG)consisting of residential development, employment, country park, nature reserve

CURRENT USE OF SITE:	BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:
Agricultural	Greenfield

CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA
<p>Amber Constraints in HELAA Access, Accessibility to Services, Utilities Capacity, Utilities Infrastructure, Contamination & Ground Stability, Flood Risk, Market Attractiveness, Significant Landscapes, Townscapes, Biodiversity & Geodiversity, Historic Environment, Open Space & GI and Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses.</p>
<p>HELAA Conclusion This site lies to the east of the A site, alongside the A47 adjoining the recent allocation at Easton, and is proposed for employment to serve the proposed new settlement. The site contains the local development order for a food hub, so food-related employment uses are already directed. Initial highway evidence has indicated that a suitable access could be achieved and any impact on local roads could be mitigated. The site is currently within walking distance of a primary school and housing, and would be accessible to the housing proposed at site A. It is likely that the water supply and sewerage network would need to be upgraded. There are overhead cables across the site and a historic landfill within it, with the potential for contamination or land instability. There are a several areas at risk of flooding, which could be avoided. The south-western third of the site is within agricultural land class 2 and the eastern part would impact on the setting of Easton church. The site would not affect a designated landscape or townscape, or public open space. A number of constraints are identified but subject to being able to overcome these the site is considered suitable for food-related employment use for the land availability assessment.</p>

FURTHER COMMENTS
<p>Highways No comments</p> <p>Development Management No comments</p> <p>Minerals & Waste Underlain or partially by S&G any future policy matters should include CS16 if allocated</p>

Lead Local Flood Authority

Strategic housing expansion areas would need specific text to ensure that flood risk and strategic drainage infrastructure is provided at master-planning stage. No site-specific comments.

PLANNING HISTORY:

Not known

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION

- Vision Statement
- Concepts
- Red Line Plan

Site Reference:	GNLP0415 E
Address:	Honingham Thorpe - Site E
Proposal:	Country Park

CURRENT USE OF SITE:	BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:
Agricultural interspersed with woodland	Greenfield

CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA
Amber Constraints in HELAA: None
HELAA Conclusion: None

FURTHER COMMENTS
<p>Highways No comments</p> <p>Development Management No comments</p> <p>Minerals & Waste Underlain or partially by S&G any future policy matters should include CS16 if allocated</p> <p>Lead Local Flood Authority Strategic housing expansion areas would need specific text to ensure that flood risk and strategic drainage infrastructure is provided at master-planning stage. No site-specific comments.</p>

PLANNING HISTORY:
Not known

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision Statement • Concepts • Red Line Plan

Site Reference:	GNLP0415 F
Address:	Honingham Thorpe - Site F
Proposal:	Nature Reserve Proposed

CURRENT USE OF SITE:	BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:
Mainly woodland with agricultural land	Greenfield

CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA
Amber Constraints in HELAA None
HELAA Conclusion None

FURTHER COMMENTS
<p>Highways No Highways comments</p> <p>Development Management No comments</p> <p>Minerals & Waste Underlain or partially by S&G any future policy matters should include CS16 if allocated</p> <p>Lead Local Flood Authority Strategic housing expansion areas would need specific text to ensure that flood risk and strategic drainage infrastructure is provided at master-planning stage. No site-specific comments.</p>

PLANNING HISTORY:
Not known

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision Statement • Concepts • Red Line Plan

Site Reference:	GNLP2176
------------------------	----------

Address:	North of Dereham Road, Honingham
Proposal:	Residential development of 55 dwellings

CURRENT USE OF SITE:	BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:
Vacant land	Greenfield

CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA
<p>Amber Constraints in HELAA Access, Access to Services, Utilities Capacity, Market Attractiveness, Historic Environment and Transport & Roads.</p> <p>Red Constraints in HELAA None</p>
<p>HELAA Conclusion This site lies to the south of Dereham Road, well-related to the existing village of Honingham. Initial highway evidence has indicated that a suitable access could be achieved, but there is no access to a school. There is a bus service within 800m and local retail, but few other services, although there is a proposal for a significant development nearby which may provide services. There are listed buildings nearby, the settings of which may be affected, but there are no sensitive townscapes or landscapes and there would be no loss of public open space. A number of constraints are identified, but subject to being able to overcome these the site is considered suitable for the land availability assessment.</p>

FURTHER COMMENTS

<p>Highways No – bus route doesn't pass through Honingham village, a safe walking route to meet it doesn't appear feasible. Could the school bus routes be adjusted to pass through Honingham village?</p> <p>If the site were allocated, it would require 2.0m wide footway and possible widening to a minimum of 5.5m, both for the full extent of the frontage. Improvements to forward visibility would also be required at the frontage. Active frontage required, would serve to strengthen existing 30mph speed limit.</p> <p>Development Management Frontage development would make a natural infill. 10-12 dwellings preferred.</p> <p>Minerals & Waste No comments</p> <p>Lead Local Flood Authority</p>
--

Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. The site has superficial deposits of Diamicton potentially limiting surface water infiltration drainage. The site does not benefit from nearby watercourses or surface water sewers. The site is south of the A47, a major highway. A drainage strategy for the site must incorporate this into the design to ensure there is no impact on current infrastructure. The site is part of a Source Protection Zone 3 and should be taken into consideration when developing a drainage strategy.

PLANNING HISTORY:

Not known

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION

- No documents

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

Four reasonable alternative sites have been identified in Easton/Honingham cluster at Stage 5 of this booklet (the collection of sites in Easton/Honingham and one in Easton/Costessey). These sites were considered to be worthy of further investigation to look at their potential for allocation as the initial assessment did not flag up any major constraints that would preclude development. These sites have been subject to further discussion with Development Management, Highways, Flood Authority and Children's Services in order to identify preferred sites for allocation and their comments are recorded under Stage 6 above.

Easton is classed as an Urban Fringe parish in the south west sector. The 'Towards a Strategy' document indicates that approx. 600 dwellings are to be allocated in this sector. It is considered that the existing allocation at EAS1 could achieve an uplift of a further 90 dwellings to contribute towards this number.

In addition, site GNLP0415 A-G has been identified for a new settlement as a reasonable alternative site if additional growth is needed.

GNLP2176 has been identified (on a reduced site boundary) for frontage development of 12 dwellings in the village of Honingham. This number will be counted towards the total for Broadland village clusters

Other sites in the cluster (GNLP0456, and GNLP0411) have been dismissed largely due to lack of a safe route to school.

In conclusion there is one carried forward allocation at Easton totalling 1,044 homes. In addition, there is one site identified as a preferred option in Honingham providing for 12 new homes and one additional dwelling with planning permission. This gives a total deliverable housing commitment for **Easton and Honingham** together of 1,057 homes between 2018 – 2038.

Preferred Sites:

Address	Site Reference	Area (Ha)	Proposal	Reason for allocating
Easton and Honingham (See Village clusters table for preferred site in Honingham)				
NO PREFERRED SITES			Uplift in numbers on existing allocation EAS 1 – 90 dwellings	No additional sites are preferred for allocation In Easton. However, it has become apparent via the planning application process that the existing large-scale allocation EAS 1 for approximately 900 dwellings could be uplifted by a further 90 dwellings. Subject to acceptable mitigation measures, an uplift of EAS 1 is the preferred approach.
Honingham (Part of Easton cluster)				
North of Dereham Road, Honingham (Easton cluster)	GNLP2176 (part).	0.76	12 dwellings	This site is preferred for allocation based on the additional work done on school bus routes. The site as promoted is too large, so it is proposed to allocate a smaller area for frontage development only which would make a nature infill development. The local highway authority support subject to provision of an adequate carriageway and footway for the full extent of the frontage.

Reasonable Alternative Sites:

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for not allocating
Easton and Honingham				
Honingham Thorpe	GNLP0415 A-G	457.14	Strategic mixed-use development consisting of residential development, employment, country park and nature reserve	This combination of sites is considered to be a reasonable alternative for consideration as a new settlement through a future review of the plan. The site is not preferred for allocation as it is not proposed to include a new settlement in the Greater Norwich Local Plan at the current time.

Unreasonable Sites:

Easton and Honingham				
Land off A47, Easton	GNLP0456	9.12	Approx. 25 dwellings	This site is not considered to be appropriate for allocation as it is located on the opposite side of the A47 to the main part of Easton village with no safe route to the primary school. The site also includes a gravel pit of geological interest.
Land at Fellowes Road, Honingham	GNLP0411	0.72	Approx. 13 dwellings	This site is over 4km to primary school in Easton with no safe walking route therefore it is not considered to be suitable for allocation. This site was re-examined through work looking at County Council bus routes to school but was dismissed as it was considered that vehicular access would be difficult as the proposed access point at Fellowes Road is extremely narrow and Mill Lane is also sub-standard.

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

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2176 Land North of Dereham Road, Honingham (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	40
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	4 Support, 34 Object, 2 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2.	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed.	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy	Site allocation removed
Member of the public	Comment	There would be immense detrimental impact to a village that is currently deprived of utilities, medical and education		Numerous objections were received to this site through the consultation. The	Site allocation removed

		services. No shop, limited bus service and an increase in pollution and narrow roads. An impact on the countryside, birds of prey and hedgerows and removal of a quaint village into a sprawling metropolis.		site was initially preferred for allocation given the potential to divert the school bus route to pick up children but after further consideration and given the level of objections received to the site this is not considered to be appropriate for such a small scale development so it has therefore been agreed to delete the allocation. Honingham has limited services and facilities to support development and there is currently no settlement limit.	
Bidwells	Support	On behalf of the Rampton Property Trust, we strongly support the preferred option. The site is entirely deliverable, and capable of making a significant		Support noted, however numerous objections were received to this site through the consultation. The	Site allocation removed

		<p>contribution towards satisfying the Councils housing needs during the period to 2038.</p> <p>It is recognised that more homes may be accommodated on the site, subject to an acceptable design and layout, as well.</p>		<p>site was initially preferred for allocation given the potential to divert the school bus route to pick up children but after further consideration and given the level of objections received to the site this is not considered to be appropriate for such a small scale development so it has therefore been agreed to delete the allocation.</p> <p>Honingham has limited services and facilities to support development and there is currently no settlement limit.</p>	
Members of the public	Support	<p>Infill, which can do no real harm to the village. Access to Norwich and Dereham will be enhanced once the A47 is improved, so commuting will be no real</p>		<p>Support noted, however numerous objections were received to this site through the consultation. The</p>	<p>Site allocation removed</p>

		<p>issue.</p> <p>Small developments in each village is far preferable to the large scale proposed for the Easton, Colton and Honingham areas. So long as this remains as small-scale infill development. It needs to be designed in a sympathetic way to limit its impact on existing properties and to blend in with surrounding area.</p>		<p>site was initially preferred for allocation given the potential to divert the school bus route to pick up children but after further consideration and given the level of objections received to the site this is not considered to be appropriate for such a small scale development so it has therefore been agreed to delete the allocation. Honingham has limited services and facilities to support development and there is currently no settlement limit.</p>	
Various members of the public	Object	<p>There is a lack of facilities, no shop, no Post Office, no School, no Doctors surgery. All these would have to be accessed outside the Village, bus</p>		<p>Numerous objections were received to this site through the consultation. The site was initially</p>	<p>Site allocation removed</p>

		<p>services are limited and cannot be relied upon for commuting. Brown field sites in Norwich are far better placed for this allocation. Few job opportunities so workers would need to commute. This is will lead to more housing, potential effect on wildlife, crime, pressure on roads, drainage. This land should be retained for food production.</p>		<p>preferred for allocation given the potential to divert the school bus route to pick up children but after further consideration and given the level of objections received to the site this is not considered to be appropriate for such a small scale development so it has therefore been agreed to delete the allocation. Honingham has limited services and facilities to support development and there is currently no settlement limit.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0415R-A-G Honingham Thorpe - Strategic mixed-use development consisting of residential development, employment, country park and nature reserve (Reasonable Alternative Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	28
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 23 Object, 5 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Honingham Parish Council	Objection	Far too large, would swamp the countryside and develop huge urban sprawl. No infrastructure, maybe a reasonable alternative in 50 years time.		There are currently no proposals to allocate a new settlement in the local plan, however GNLP0415 is being considered within the context of options for a new settlement in the future	None
Members of the Public	Objection	This scale of development would have a detrimental effect on a large surrounding area as		There are currently no proposals to allocate a new settlement in the	None

		<p>highlighted from many local parishes about the effect of increased traffic resulting from proposed new road schemes terminating in the Honingham area. This site could have far more impact on these people.</p> <p>As already pointed out these sites are proposed on irreplaceable prime agricultural land.</p> <p>A development of this scale should only be part of the city of Norwich not annexed in the countryside.</p> <p>Concern over the lack of facilities including doctors, shop, bus service, etc.</p> <p>Potential impact on existing infrastructure, wildlife, etc. Duelling of the Western link is necessary but not the Garden Village.</p>		<p>local plan, however GNLP0415 is being considered within the context of options for a new settlement in the future</p>	
Environment Agency	Comment	<p>GNLP0415R-E and GNLP0415R-F Allocations adjacent to the River Yare of a nature reserve and Country Park are welcomed.</p>		<p>There are currently no proposals to allocate a new settlement in the local plan, however GNLP0415 is being</p>	None

		<p>GNLP0415R-E The south of this site allocation, adjacent to the river lies in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Our detailed modelling shows that much of the area covered by Flood Zone 3 is actually Flood Zone 3b Therefore, it would be preferable if any associated built development is located within Flood Zone 1, and all development within the flood zones meets the above requirements.</p> <p>GNLP0415R-F The north of the site adjacent to the river lies in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Our detailed modelling shows that quite a lot of the area covered by Flood Zone 3 is actually Flood Zone 3b. As a nature reserve would be classed as water compatible development under Amenity open space, nature conservation</p>		<p>considered within the context of options for a new settlement in the future</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>and biodiversity then this would be an acceptable land use within the flood zones, including Flood Zone 3b, providing that it is designed to: remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere. Therefore, it would be preferable if any associated built development is located within Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>GNLP0415R-A, GNLP0415R-C There are two sites adjacent to the River Tud another chalk stream , we need to ensure that any water discharging from the development is as clean as possible and that SuDS are sufficient, a WFD compliance assessment must be undertaken.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0456 Land off A47, Easton (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Easton Parish Council	Comment	Support the reasoning of no safe connection to the main part of the village however as the A47 is in the process of being improved and the Parish Council is working with Highways England to provide a suitable safe route for pedestrians and cyclists across the A47. We do not feel it should be discounted until Highways England have finalised their design plans for the A47 improvements in this area.		The prospect of future improvements in this area that may facilitate a pedestrian/cycle crossing across the A47 are noted but without any firm proposals for this to take place this site cannot be considered for allocation at the current time.	None

Members of the Public	Support	Concerned over the potential impact on the village, wildlife, lack of infrastructure.		Comments noted	None
-----------------------	---------	---	--	----------------	------

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0411 Land at Fellowes Road, Honingham (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	4
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	3 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Honingham Parish Council	Support	Honingham Parish Council support the classification of site GNLP0411 as being unreasonable. This site is wholly unsuitable for development, not least because of the very limited access, but the nature of the site as being sloping. There are no services within the village making this site unsustainable and unsuitable.		Comment noted	None
Members of the Public	Support	Small land area on a slope, once concreted over all the water that would have		Comments noted	None

		<p>been absorbed will wash into Mill Lane flooding homes and the unmade road. Flooding already a problem at entrance to Mill Lane, this will just exacerbate it. Only access will be via Colton Road - which is actually a single track road unsuitable for the constant flow of heavy vehicles needed during build phase. Safety concerns over Fellowes Road. No amenities in village such as schools, Drs, shops, buses. Would need cars therefore extra pollution.</p>			
Brown & Co	Object	<p>The proposal would form a better alternative to the current proposed allocation by virtue of its relationship with the main built form of the village, proximity to bus stops, and opportunity to improve the permeability and connectivity of the village. Enhancements would be delivered to ensure suitable safe access could be provided</p>		<p>This site is not considered suitable for allocation as it is over 4km to Easton Primary School with no safe walking route. The local highway authority has indicated that vehicular access would be difficult as the proposed</p>	None

		to the site for vehicles and pedestrians alike, as a result it is considered that safe access to school could be provided for children.		access point at Fellowes Road is extremely narrow and Mill Lane is substandard	
--	--	---	--	--	--

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

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

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

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Proposal	Status Reg.18 c
Easton and Honingham				
North of Dereham Road, Honingham	GNLP2176R	1.37	25 dwellings	Preferred Site
TOTAL		1.37		

STAGE 2 – HELAA COMPARISON TABLE

	Categories													
	Site access	Access to services	Utilities Capacity	Utilities Infrastructure	Contamination/ground stability	Flood Risk	Market attractiveness	significant landscapes	Sensitive townscapes	Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Historic environment	Open Space and GI	Transport & Roads	Compatibility with neighbouring uses
Site Reference														
	Norwich Fringe													
GNLP2176R	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green

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

(See part 2 above)

STAGE 4 – DISCUSSION OF NEW & REVISED SITES

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

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

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

Easton and Honingham

GNLP2176R is a revised greenfield site (to former preferred option) to the north of Dereham Road proposing a reduction from the original site area of 3.7ha to 1.37 ha; and only 25 dwellings instead of 55 as originally suggested. The site was preferred on a much smaller boundary and at a reduced number of dwellings than the original proposal (0.76ha – 12 dwellings) at Regulation 18C, to allow for frontage development only. Therefore, the proposed revision will need to be assessed in this context. As such, the site is well related to the existing village of Honingham with residential development to the east and opposite of the site. Although, the site was considered a preferred option, there are other sites which are more sustainably where access to services and facilities may be less constrained. In conclusion it is considered to be reasonable to shortlist for further assessment at this stage subject to highways comments on the proposed road layout submitted by the promoter and achieving safe access to school, as well as, subject to Development Management on landscape character impact. These comments will be taken account of to inform site suitability conclusions at Regulation 19.

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

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

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Proposal
Easton and Honingham			
North of Dereham Road, Honingham	GNLP2176R	1.37	Housing
TOTAL		1.37	

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

Site Reference:	GNLP2176R
Address:	North of Dereham Road, Honingham
Proposal:	Housing 1.37

CURRENT USE OF SITE:	BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:
Vacant land	Greenfield

CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA
<p>Amber Constraints in HELAA Access, Access to Services, Utilities Capacity, Market Attractiveness, Historic Environment and Transport & Roads, compatibility with neighbours</p> <p>Red Constraints in HELAA</p>
<p>HELAA Conclusion This is a revised greenfield site to the north of Dereham Road proposing a reduction from 3.7ha to 1.37 ha; 55 dwellings to 25 dwellings. The site is well related to the existing village of Honingham with residential development to the east and opposite of the site, however the village is very limited in the services as there is no GP, school or shops. Initial highway evidence has indicated that a suitable access could be achieved, but there is no access to a school. There is a bus service within 800m and local retail, but few other services. Transport would be needed to the neighbouring Hockering 2.7km away for school and Mattishall 6km away for a GP. There is a bus stop 800m away though there is no footpath and the bus service will currently only stop here on request. Sewerage infrastructure upgrades are likely to be needed, including enhancement to the water recycling centre. Other considerations are; the site is within Source Protection Zone 3, Grade II listed heritage cottages and war memorial to the east approx. 38-100 meters , few patches of low risk of surface water flooding on Dereham Road, utilities poles on the site, the mature trees to south east of site and the possibility of protected species, Barbastelle Bats, habitats on or near the site. County Wildlife Fen Plantation to the south west approx. 139 meters. There are no concerns over loss of open space or high-quality agricultural land as it is grade 3 and 4. The A47 is approx 170 m to the north where noise is likely to be a constraint. Despite the potential constraints noted, these could be suitably overcome and so the site is considered suitable for the land availability assessment. However, as the site has already been assessed for the purposes of the HELAA it will not contribute any additional capacity without double-counting and has therefore been marked unsuitable.</p>

FURTHER COMMENTS**Highways**

No safe walking/cycling route to catchment primary school at Easton. Bus provision to Easton School does not appear to pass through Honingham village, please confirm what additional work has been carried out re school transport. Site has sufficient frontage to provide acceptable access, would require 2.0m wide footway at frontage with suitable crossings to south side of road. Connect f/w to ex facility to east if possible - potential encroachment at frontage of 44 Dereham Rd. Carriageway widening may also be required to provide a minimum of 5.5m at the frontage. Would require TA & implementation of any agreed measures.

Development Management

Concerned about the lack of facilities at this location and safe access to school and sustainability also there is no settlement limit at this location.

Minerals & Waste

No comments

Lead Local Flood Authority

Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. The site has superficial deposits of Diamicton potentially limiting surface water infiltration drainage. The site does not benefit from nearby watercourses or surface water sewers. The site is south of the A47, a major highway. A drainage strategy for the site must incorporate this into the design to ensure there is no impact on current infrastructure. The site is part of a Source Protection Zone 3 and should be taken into consideration when developing a drainage strategy.

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

- Flood Risk and Drainage Feasibility Study,
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report,
- Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment,
- Initial design market square analysis and Phase 1 – Transport Strategy.

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

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

New and revised sites to be considered for allocation:

None

New and revised sites considered to be unreasonable for allocation:

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
North of Dereham Road	GNLP2176R	1.37	25 dwellings	<p>This site was originally submitted on a larger boundary to accommodate 55 dwellings. It was considered through work to look at County Council bus routes to school and included as a preferred option in the Regulation 18C consultation on a much smaller boundary for 12 dwellings. A revision to the site was then submitted through the Regulation 18C consultation to increase the site to 1.37ha and 25 dwellings.</p> <p>Numerous objections were received to this site through the Regulation 18C consultation, including rural setting, lack of services and facilities, limited bus service, no safe access to school, highway issues and impact on landscape character.</p>

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
				<p>The site was initially preferred for allocation given the potential to divert the school bus route to pick up children but after further consideration this is not considered to be appropriate for such a small scale development therefore the site has been deleted as an allocation.</p>

FINAL CONCLUSIONS FOR THE REGULATION 19 VERSION OF THE PLAN

Site assessments prior to the Regulation 18C consultation

Up to the Regulation 18C consultation there were 3 sites promoted for residential/mixed use in the Easton cluster totalling 93 dwellings and 13.58ha of land plus the addition of a new settlement proposal at Honingham Thorpe. The outcome of initial site assessment work (which is detailed in part 1 of this booklet) was to prefer site GNLP2176 on a smaller boundary than submitted for 12 dwellings. This site was preferred for allocation based on additional work done on school bus routes and was consulted on through the Regulation 18C consultation. In addition the new settlement proposal at Honingham Thorpe was considered to be a reasonable alternative for consideration through a future review of the plan. Other sites promoted were considered to be unreasonable for allocation as they do not have a safe walking route to school.

Summary of comments from the Regulation 18C draft plan consultation

Through the Regulation 18C consultation a number of comments were received regarding sites in Easton (detailed in part 2 above). The main comments received were a mixture of objections and supports for the allocation of site GNLP2176 and comments regarding the new settlement proposal at Honingham Thorpe. All consultation comments were given due consideration and with regard to Honingham Thorpe there are currently no proposals to allocate a new settlement in the local plan, however GNLP0415 is being considered within the context of options for a new settlement in the future. With regard to site GNLP2176, after careful consideration of the objections received including rural setting, lack of services and facilities, limited bus service, no safe access to school, highway issues and impact on landscape character the selection of this site as a preferred allocation has been re considered. The site was initially preferred for allocation given the potential to divert the school bus route to pick up children but after further consideration this is not considered to be appropriate for such a small scale allocation in a settlement which does not currently have a settlement limit, therefore the site will be deleted as an allocation.

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

A revision to site GNLP2176 was proposed through the Regulation 18C consultation to increase the size of the allocation up to 25 dwellings and 1.37ha of land. All the new and revised sites were subject to the same process of assessment as the earlier sites (detailed in part 3 of this booklet). The conclusion of this work was that this site revision does not change the view detailed above that the site should be deleted as an allocation.

Sustainability Appraisal

The sustainability performance of each reasonable alternative site has been considered in the selection of sites. The Sustainability Appraisal includes a scoring and assessment narrative on the sustainability performance of each reasonable alternative and recommendations for mitigation measures which have been incorporated in policy requirements as appropriate. The Sustainability Appraisal (insert link) highlighted positive and negative scores for the sites in the Easton cluster. The new settlement proposal GNLP0415 scored a number of double negatives but it is likely that many of these could be addressed through development given the scale of the proposal. Site GNLP2176 in Honingham scored double negatives for health and education reflecting its location distance from basic services and facilities. The SA shows that all the different versions of site GNLP2176 (the original, the smaller site defined at Regulation 18C and the subsequent revision submitted through the consultation) all score more or less the same, other than the smaller versions of the site which score a minor positive for economy. The SA does not change the view that following further consideration site GNLP2176 should not be allocated.


Final conclusion on sites for allocation in the Regulation 19 Plan

Based on all the information contained within this booklet the final conclusion of the site assessment process for Easton and Honingham is not to allocate any new sites in addition to carried forward allocation EAS1.

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

EASTON AND HONINGHAM

GREATER NORWICH LOCAL PLAN PROMOTED SITES BY SCHOOL CATCHMENT AREAS



The schools data is used by permission of Norfolk County Council

© Crown copyright and database right 2020 Ordnance Survey 100019340

- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------|-----------------|
| Primary School | Contingency Housing Allocation | Employment Allocation | Redevelopment of Existing Uses within Settlement Boundary | Not Allocated | Parish Boundary |
| Primary School Catchment (2018-19) | Housing Allocation | Open Space/Leisure Amenity Allocation | Showground Specific Policy | Settlement Boundary | Commitment* |

*new and extant permissions at 1st April 2020 (10 or more dwellings)

N
1:22,500
at A3
Date: 26/11/2020