

URBAN FRINGE – (EXCLUDING NORWICH)

COLNEY STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT/ BAWBURGH RECREATION

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	COLNEY OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	15
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	4 Support,5 Object, 6 Comment

Colney/Bawburgh has 2 preferred options, 3 carried forward allocations, No reasonable alternatives and 8 unreasonable sites (4 residential and 4 employment).

Main Issues

Policy COL1 - Land adjacent to Norwich Research Park (NRP), Colney - (Carried Forward Allocation)

- Historic England suggest that the policy be amended to include reference to the heritage assets and the need to conserve and where appropriate enhance them

Policy COL2 / GNLP0140-C - Land rear/east of Institute of Food Research (IFR), Colney - (Carried Forward Allocation)

- UEA Estates & Buildings/Bidwells support the site and demonstrate that it is viable and deliverable.
- Environment Agency (Eastern Region) comment that the site boundary has been drawn to exclude the current and future flood zones just to the east of the site, and therefore the sequential approach has been correctly applied.

- Historic England suggest that the policy be amended to include reference to the heritage assets and the need to conserve and where appropriate enhance them including Earlham Conservation Area and associated listed buildings.

Policy BAW2 Bawburgh and Colney Lakes (Carried Forward Allocation)

- Norfolk Wildlife Trust comment that specific wording needs to be included in the allocation policies to ensure that ecological concerns are properly addressed at the planning application stage.
- The Yare Valley Society support the allocation and state that the rapid increase in population in the vicinity of the Yare Valley due to residential development has created an urgent need for additional recreational green space to relieve pressure on the existing green space.
- A number of respondents have flagged up that the description of development on the map is wrong. Instead of 'carried forward retail/commercial development' it should refer to a water based country park.
- Glavenhill/Lanpro object to BAW2 as it is not effective as it is privately owned and currently let to a third party. Public access to the site is not achievable and it is not available to offset the impacts of housing growth.

Site GNLP0514 - Old Watton Road, Colney - (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Individual / Agent - the assessment of site GNLP0514 does not seem specific to the site, has general principles applied that are incorrect.

Site GNLP0253 – Colney Hall, Watton Road, Colney - (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Agent – this proposal offers a unique opportunity to live independently while benefitting from on- site research presence.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Preferred Sites

- GNLP0331R – B
- GNLP0331 – C

Carried Forward Allocations

- Policy COL3

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP0158
- GNLP0592

Unreasonable Non-Residential Sites

- GNLP0140 – A
- GNLP0140 – B
- GNLP0331R – A
- GNLP0244

Colney/Bawburgh – Carried Forward Allocations

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy COL1 Land adjacent to Norwich Research Park (NRP), Colney (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Historic England	Object	Suggested Change: We suggest that the policy be amended to include reference to the heritage assets and the need to conserve and where appropriate enhance them Suggested wording: Development should conserve or where appropriate enhance the significance of nearby heritage assets including Old Hall and its wall, and		It is accepted that the policy should acknowledge the potential for harm to the heritage assets and the requirement for measure to address this.	Add policy requirement to COL1 to read: 'Any development must conserve and enhance the significance of the Old Hall and its wall and the Rectory, including any contribution made to that

		the Rectory (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset) through appropriate landscaping, density and design.			significance by setting. This includes but is not limited to appropriate landscaping, density and design'.
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2.	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed.	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy	None

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy COL2 / GNLP0140-C Land rear/east of Institute of Food Research (IFR), Colney (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
UEA Estates & Buildings	Support	It has been demonstrated, the site is suitable, available, achievable and viable, and is deliverable within the plan period. Accordingly, the foregoing text demonstrates that this specific site is a suitable location for development, and the UEA support the GNLP's proposals to allocate the site for B1(b) Science Park development, hospital expansion and other proposals ancillary and		Comment noted	None

		complementary to these uses.			
Environment Agency	Comment	It appears that the site boundary has been drawn to exclude the current and future flood zones just to the east of the site, and therefore the sequential approach has been correctly applied.		Comment noted	No change
Historic England	Object	<p>Suggested Change: We suggest that the policy be amended to include reference to the heritage assets and the need to conserve and where appropriate enhance them</p> <p>Suggested wording: Development should conserve or where appropriate enhance the significance of nearby heritage assets including Earlham Conservation Area and associated listed buildings (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset) through appropriate landscaping, density and design.</p>		It is accepted that the policy should acknowledge the potential for harm to the heritage asset(s) and the requirement for measures to address this	Add policy requirement to COL2 to read: 'Any development must conserve and enhance the significance of nearby heritage assets including Earlham Conservation Area and associated listed buildings to the west, including any contribution made to that significance by setting. This

					includes but is not limited to appropriate landscaping, density and design.
--	--	--	--	--	---

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy BAW2 Bawburgh and Colney Lakes (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	7
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 2 Object, 3 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Yare Valley Society	Support	The rapid increase in population in the vicinity of the Yare Valley due to residential development at Bowthorpe, Cringleford, Little Melton and elsewhere has created an urgent need for additional recreational green space on the Valley to relieve pressure on the existing green space (many well-worn paths one indicator of overuse). A Country Park at Bawburgh Lakes should be		Comment noted	None

		given high priority. In the interim a policy should be put in place for an extension of the Yare Valley Walk and for managing the site's habitats.			
Member of the public	Support	Strongly support the creation of a country park in this location and unreservedly welcome the conservation management plan. It highlights the importance of this location's environment and biodiversity whilst also providing some public access in the form of footpaths and cycle routes. The provision of more open green spaces are called for in view of the new residential developments in Bowthorpe and Cringleford, for example. In addition, the proposed country park could help to reduce the pressure from informal recreation in the Yare Valley.		Comment noted	None

Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Comment	<p>The inclusion of this site, on the Bawburgh/Colney Pits CWS is dependent on the guarantee that it is only as green infrastructure, and not as retail/ commercial land as described in the draft plan. Any proposals for the site would need to ensure that the ecological value of the CWS is retained and enhanced if they are to be made open to the public.</p>		<p>Comment noted. Correct map legend</p>	<p>Correct map legend. . Amend policy to refer to the need to ensure the ecological value of the CWS is retained and enhanced .in areas made open to the public.</p>
Yare Valley Society	Comment	<p>The words beneath the map state "carried forward retail/commercial development". This would appear to contradict the heading which states the allocation is for a water-based country park.</p> <p>The Yare Valley Society would expect the words under the map to emphasise allocation for green space and leisure activities.</p> <p>The words on the map should be changed to</p>		<p>Comment noted. Correct map legend</p>	<p>Correct map legend</p>

		reflect the intention to develop the site as a water-based country park.			
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed.	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy	None
Historic England	Object	We note that this site is allocated for a water based country park and yet on the Colney Inset Map on page 2 the key shows this area as a retail/commercial allocation. Suggested Change: Amend key to show as a recreational allocation		Comment noted. Correct map legend	Correct map legend
Glavenhill Lanpro	Object	Our proposal (GNLP0294) proposes open space and tree planting which is fully costed and will be delivered to offset the impacts of planned housing growth on the network of Natura 2000 sites including The Broads National Park. For this reason, my client also objects to emerging		This allocation is being carried forward from the South Norfolk Local Plan and as such it has been through a process of public examination and adoption.	None

		allocation BAW2 relating to Bawburgh and Colney Lakes as it is not effective as it is privately owned, currently let to a third party, no public access to the site is achievable and it is not available to offset the impacts of housing growth. In the absence of evidence to the contrary the BAW2 allocation is unsound and should be removed from the emerging Local Plan.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

Colney/Bawburgh – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0514 Old Watton Road, Colney (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Individual / Agent	Comment	The assessment of site GNLP0514 does not seem specific to the site, has general principles applied that are incorrect. As a site situated as part of an existing settlement, with new homes being build 100 meters further up Old Watton Road, opposite the Spire Hospital, very close to the Research Park and Norfolk and Norwich Hospital, parish church,		This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as it is remote from services and facilities and there is currently no settlement limit in this location. Site has landscape and flood issues and there is no safe walking route to the	None

		UEA, safe route to local school, etc and a road network that links to A47 and City Centre with access to public transport. This is a sustainable location.		catchment primary school.	
Member of the public	Object	Site should be reassessed. Unfairly classified as unreasonable. It is a reasonable site being sustainable - proximity to two hospitals, adjacent to surrounding housing, local employment at the research park or City centre through public transport with no negative impacts on a very good local road network. Assessment 14 categories 9 green and 5 amber what's wrong with the site Site GNLP0514 should be the preferred site in the absence of any choice of alternative suitable sites. It also will help with the requirement of at least 10% smaller sites in the National Planning Policy Framework."		This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as it is remote from services and facilities and there is currently no settlement limit in this location. Site has landscape and flood issues and there is no safe walking route to the catchment primary school.	None

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0253 – Colney Hall, Watton Road, Colney (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	GNLP RESPONSE	CHANGE TO PLAN
Feng Li (Agent) on behalf of owner	Object	This offers a unique opportunity to live independently while benefitting from the latest health and social care research Unique opportunity to integrate research and delivery: The on-site research presence will provide direct access to the Colney community who will in turn benefit from unparalleled research outcomes and access to global leading academics and professionals.	Consider additional supporting evidence in the context of providing housing with care	The suitability of this site for allocation has been reassessed in the context of the need to provide for the housing needs of older people. It has been decided to allocate the site for the unique opportunity it presents to secure a residential led development for older people that is supplemented by	Site GNLP0253 to be allocated

				related university research space and healthcare facilities.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

COSTESSEY

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	COSTESSEY OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	11
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 5 Object, 4 Comment

Costessey has 0 preferred options, 3 carried forward allocations , 3 reasonable alternatives and 12 unreasonable sites (11 residential 1, non-residential)

Main issues

Policy COS3 – Site GNLP2008 - Longwater Employment Area, Costessey - (Carried Forward Allocation)

- None

Policy COS5- Site GNLP2074 - Royal Norfolk Showground, Costessey - (Carried Forward Allocation)

- Mr Michael Haslam (Agent) supports policy COS5/GNLP2074 subject to the inclusion of the words in the policy and revisions as set out in the notes underneath the policy.

Site GNLP0581- Land of Bawburgh Lane and New Road - (Reasonable Alternative Site - Contingency for 1000 dwellings in the draft plan (along with GNLP2143) if required)

- Gladman Developments - Support as if allocated, the development would deliver significant benefits to the local area and wider community.
- Carter Jonas LLP- concerns whether this strategic extension would provide policy compliant levels of affordable housing considering the costs of providing primary infrastructure in advance of development.
- Members of the public – Dereham Road overloaded with cars, need for cycle routes to city, easy bus access, no direct access of New Road. Bawburgh village is already a rat run.

Site GNLP2043 - North of New Road, east of A47 - (Reasonable Alternative Site – Contingency for 1000 dwellings in the draft plan (along with GNLP0581) if required)

- Member of the public - Bawburgh village is already a rat run, with excessive speed, water runoff will need to be diverted from the site rather than soaking into the fields.
- Carter Jonas LLP – Object as the delivery of this site is reliant on the larger site (0508) for access arrangements and could not come forward separately.

Site GNLP0284R Townhouse Road, Costessey - (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Carter Jonas LLP – Object as this site with different development options could meet the requirements for a contingency site to meet non-delivery of commitments and allocations elsewhere.

Site GNLP2138 North of Gunton Lane, Costessey (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- GP Planning Ltd – Object to the site being unreasonable. The reasoned justification relates to its location in flood zones and its ecological interest. There is considered to be sufficient developable land outside the flood zone.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Carried Forward Allocation:

- Policy COS4

Reasonable Alternative Site:

- GNLP0593

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP0039
- GNLP0206
- GNLP0238
- GNLP0243
- GNLP0266
- GNLP0468
- GNLP0489
- GNLP2004
- GNLP2156

Unreasonable Non-residential Site

- GNLP0376

Costessey - Carried Forward Allocations

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy COS3 – Site GNLPSL2008 Longwater Employment Area, Costessey (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLPSL 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	None

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy COS5- Site GNLP2074 Royal Norfolk Showground, Costessey (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Michael Haslam (Agent)	Support	We support policy COS5/GNLP2074 subject to the inclusion of the words in the policy and revisions as set out in the notes underneath the policy.		Support noted	None

Costessey – Reasonable Alternative Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0581 Land of Bawburgh Lane and New Road (Reasonable Alternative Site - Contingency for 1000 dwellings in the draft plan (along with GNLP2143) if required)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	4
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comments

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Members of the public	Comment	Dereham Road overloaded with cars, need for cycle routes to city, easy bus access, no direct access of New Road. Bawburgh village is already a rat run, with excessive speed, water runoff will need to be diverted from the site rather than soaking into the fields.		Include as a contingency site with GNLP2043. This site will become an allocation if there are three consecutive years in which Annual Monitoring Reports show that housing	To be included in the plan (together with GNLP2043) as a contingency site for 800 dwellings.

				<p>completions in Greater Norwich are more than 10% below annual targets. The concerns raised will be mitigated through policy requirements.</p>	
Carter Jonas LLP	Object	<p>Concerns whether this strategic extension would provide policy compliant levels of affordable housing taking into account the costs of providing primary infrastructure in advance of development. This together with constraints identified does not equate to reasonable alternative. It is requested that this site is deleted as a reasonable alternative housing allocation.</p>		<p>Include as a contingency site with GNLP2043. This site will become an allocation if there are three consecutive years in which Annual Monitoring Reports show that housing completions in Greater Norwich are more than 10% below annual targets. New development will be expected to be compliant with strategic policies unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated.</p>	<p>To be included in the plan (together with GNLP2043) as a contingency site for 800 dwellings.</p>

Gladman Developments	Support	If allocated, the development would deliver significant benefits to the local area and wider community, including: 600+ dwellings, providing for a wide range of tenure, size and types of new homes; 33% affordable homes; child play provision; access links to the southern land parcel; pedestrian and cycling links/improvements; recreational green open space, a net-biodiversity gain and support for existing local services through increased use and spend.		Include as a contingency site with 2043. This site will become an allocation if there are three consecutive years in which Annual Monitoring Reports show that housing completions in Greater Norwich are more than 10% below annual targets	To be included in the plan (together with GNLP2043) as a contingency site for 800 dwellings.
----------------------	---------	--	--	--	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2043 North of New Road, east of A47 (Reasonable Alternative Site – Contingency for 1000 dwellings (along with GNLP0581) if required)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 2 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Member of the public	Comment	Bawburgh village is already a rat run, with excessive speed, water runoff will need to be diverted from the site rather than soaking into the fields.		Include as a contingency site with GNLP0581. This site will become an allocation if there are three consecutive years in which Annual Monitoring Reports show that housing completions in Greater Norwich are more than 10% below annual	To be included in the plan (together with GNLP0581) as a contingency site for 800 dwellings.

				targets. The concerns raised will be mitigated through policy requirements.	
Carter Jonas LLP	Object	The delivery of this site is reliant on the larger site (0581) for access arrangements and could not come forward separately. The constraints to development are similar to those that exist for the larger site therefore, the site is also not available as a contingency to meet non-delivery of housing at commitments and allocations. Therefore, it is requested that this site is deleted as a reasonable alternative housing allocation.		Include as a contingency site with GNLP0581. This site will become an allocation if there are three consecutive years in which Annual Monitoring Reports show that housing completions in Greater Norwich are more than 10% below annual targets.	To be included in the plan (together with GNLP0581) as a contingency site for 800 dwellings.
Member of the public	Object	Concerned how development here could incorporate bus and cycle travel as the main form of travel for residents. This would make the development car dependent, which is not consistent with the Climate	Further investigations with Highway Authority to this regard.	Include as a contingency site with GNLP0581. This site will become an allocation if there are three consecutive years in which Annual	To be included in the plan (together with GNLP0581) as a contingency site for 800 dwellings.

		Emergency declarations of the City Council.		Monitoring Reports show that housing completions in Greater Norwich are more than 10% below annual targets. The concerns raised will be mitigated through policy requirements.	
--	--	---	--	--	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0284R Townhouse Road, Costessey (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Carter Jonas LLP	Object	The site with different development options for the site i.e. 100, 130 and 200 dwellings is smaller than the proposed strategic extension sites (GNLP0581 and GNLP2043) and as such it could meet the requirements for a contingency site to meet non-delivery at the commitments and allocations elsewhere. A number of technical reports have been submitted for further consideration.		See justification given for the rejection of the site in Site Assessment booklet for Costessey. It is considered that development of this site would have an adverse impact on the character of the designated river valley even at the smallest proposal suggested.	None

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2138 North of Gunton Lane, Costessey (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
GP Planning Ltd	Object	The landowner of the site OBJECTS to it being considered unreasonable. The reasoned justification relates to its location in flood zones and its ecological interest. There is sufficient land outside the flood zone that could be developed without impacting on flood risk. The remaining land could be preserved and enhanced for biodiversity.		See justification given for the rejection of the site in Site Assessment booklet for Costessey. It is considered that the developable area would be significantly affected by flood risk, the site is within the designated river valley and wholly within a County Wildlife Site	None

CRINGLEFORD INCLUDING EMPLOYMENT LAND AT KESWICK

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	CRINGLEFORD INCLUDING EMPLOYMENT LAND AT KESWICK OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	17
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	5 Support, 3 Object, 9 Comment

Cringleford (including employment land at Keswick) has 0 preferred sites, 2 carried forward/uplift allocations, 0 reasonable alternative sites and 1 unreasonable site.

Main issues

Policy HOU1 – GNLP0307 /GNLP0327 Land north and south of the A11, Cringleford - (Carried Forward Allocation and Uplift)

- Environment Agency – The site GNLP0307 is adjacent to a stream with a significant section of culverted watercourse (1.2 km in total). We would support opening up this stream again as well as any contribution towards enhancing the natural habitats of the Yare Valley.
- Highways England - It is likely that the proposed improvement of the A47 Thickthorn Interchange will be able to accommodate the proposed 360 dwelling uplift. However, this view should be confirmed with a transport assessment.
- Barratt David Wilson Homes /Pegasus Planning Group - BDW's interest relates to the part of the preferred allocation identified as GNLP0307, which had previously promoted through the GNLP process for additional housing. The remainder of site GNLP0307 has the capacity to accommodate a greater number of dwellings than the uplift. Also object to assessment and HELAA.

- Cringleford Parish Council - Generally supportive of the plan for the Parish, and the uplift within the settlement boundary. Furthermore, it is grateful for the continued recognition of some sensitive sites that have been designated unreasonable.
- Historic England - Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the grade II listed Round House lies to the south east of the site. However, it would appear that there is an existing commitment between the proposed site and the Round House and so there will be no additional harm to that already permitted.

Policy KES2 – Site GNLP0497 Land west of Ipswich Road, Keswick (Carried Forward Employment Allocation)

- Norfolk Wildlife Trust - Specific ecological concerns regarding allocations. KES2 is adjacent to Harford Bridge Marshes CWS and NWT Nature Reserve. Run-off from the development onto the CWS may be an issue and will need to be mitigated for.
- Norwich Apex Limited / Lanpro Services Ltd - Norwich Apex secured planning permission for Apex Business Park in 2018 from South Norfolk Council (2017/2794) and are currently assembling the required infrastructure for the site (including the access, link road and strategic landscaping).
- Keswick and Intwood Parish Council - No further approval should be granted until various impacts potentially identified are ruled out.
- Historic England - Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the grade II listed church of all Saints and remains of the Church of All Saints lies to the west of the site. Any development has the potential to impact upon the setting of these designated heritage assets. There is currently no mention of these assets within the policy or of the need to conserve and where appropriate enhance the significance of these nearby heritage assets. Suggested policy wording included.

Site GNLP0461 Land off Gurney Lane, Cringleford (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Cringleford Parish Council - Generally supportive of the plan for the Parish, and the uplift within the settlement boundary. Furthermore, it is grateful for the continued recognition of some sensitive sites that have been designated unreasonable

Site GNLP3047 A140/Mulbarton Road, Keswick (Unreasonable Non-Residential Site)

- Lanpro Services Ltd - The site is in a sustainable location and represents an important employment opportunity that should be included in the GNLP.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Cringleford (including employment land at Keswick)– Carried Forward Allocation/Uplift

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy HOU1 – GNLP0307 /GNLP0327 Land north and south of the A11, Cringleford (Carried Forward Allocation Neighbourhood Plan and Uplift)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	10
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 2 Object, 7 Comments

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	None
Environment Agency	Comment	The site GNLP0307 is adjacent to a stream with a significant section of culverted watercourse (1.2 km in total). We would support opening up this stream again as well as		This can be addressed though the supporting text for this policy	Add reference to supporting text

		any contribution towards enhancing the natural habitats of the Yare Valley.			
Highways England	Comment	It is likely that the proposed improvement of the A47 Thickthorn Interchange will be able to accommodate the proposed 360 dwelling uplift. However, this view should be confirmed with a transport assessment		This can be addressed through policy requirements and supporting text	Amend policy and supporting text
Barratt David Wilson Homes /Pegasus Planning Group	Comment	BDW's interest relates to the part of the preferred allocation identified as GNLP0307, which BDW has previously promoted through the GNLP process for additional housing. In response to the proposed uplift BDW has carried out additional work to support the further development of their site. This work also demonstrates <u>that the remainder of site</u> GNLP0307 has the capacity to accommodate a greater number of dwellings than the uplift of 360 homes that are proposed across the	Further consideration of potential uplift on the site	The capacity has been increased to reflect changes to site layout in coordination with Development Management officers. Uplift now proposed to be 410 dwellings.	Amend overall housing number in policy. Refer to increased uplift figure in supporting text.

		balance of site GNLP0307 and site GNLP0327.			
Barratt David Wilson Homes /Pegasus Planning Group	Comment	Response to HELAA assessment with regards to constraints identified and reference to additional supporting documents to demonstrate how these can be successfully mitigated in order to deliver additional housing numbers.		Changes to site policy reflect the outcome of further site assessment and agreements with Development Management officers. No change is proposed to the HELAA	None
Barratt David Wilson Homes /Pegasus Planning Group	Object	Disagree with the high-level assessment that only 35% of the site is suitable for further development or that the uplift numbers should be restricted to 360 homes for both the remainder of site GNLP0327 and site GNLP0327. The development of phase two of Newfound Farm has the potential to deliver 500 dwellings at a density that is accepted within the Norwich urban area, of which Cringleford parish is part of.	Further consideration of potential uplift on the site	The capacity has been increased to reflect changes to site layout in coordination with Development Management officers. Uplift now proposed to be 410 dwellings.	Amend overall housing number in policy. Refer to increased uplift figure in supporting text.

		To overcome this objection, request that the preferred allocation be amended to reflect the delivery of an additional 500 homes plus land for a primary school on the remainder of the GNLP0307 site that is not covered by the consented scheme.			
Cringleford Parish Council	Support	Cringleford Parish Council is generally supportive of the plan for the Parish, and the uplift within the settlement boundary. Furthermore, it is grateful for the continued recognition of some sensitive sites that have been designated unreasonable.		Comment noted	None
Historic England	Support	Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, a grade II listed Round House lies to the south east of the site. However, it would appear that there is an existing commitment between the proposed site		Comment noted	None

		and the Round House and so there will be no additional harm to that already permitted,			
Barratt David Wilson Homes /Pegasus Planning Group	Object	Phase one of the development at Cringleford relates to the consented scheme at Newfound Farm, which is being implemented. Phase two relates to the additional land that the GNLP now proposes for additional housing. Some 11ha of net developable area has been identified, which has a capacity of approximately 500 dwellings based on an average density of 44 dwellings per hectare (dph).	Further consideration of potential uplift on the site	The capacity has been increased to reflect changes to site layout in coordination with Development Management officers. Uplift now proposed to be 410 dwellings.	Amend overall housing number in policy. Refer to increased uplift figure in supporting text.

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy KES2 – Site GNLP0497 Land west of Ipswich Road, Keswick (Carried Forward Employment Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	5
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 2 Object, 2 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2.	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed.	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy	None
Norfolk Wildlife Trust		Our comments below relate to specific ecological concerns regarding allocations. In addition to the protection provided in Policy 2, we recommend that specific wording is included in the allocation	Consistent policy approach with regards to ecology.	Amend Policy to reflect the need for mitigation measures to protect the Harford Bridge Marshes CWS and Nature Reserve.	Amend policy requirements

		<p>policies to ensure accompanied by an ecological appraisal, with provision of biodiversity net gain and sufficient buffering and safeguarding space secured between the development and the wildlife site in perpetuity (potentially also delivering contributions to green infrastructure).</p> <p>KES2 this site is adjacent to Harford Bridge Marshes CWS and NWT Nature Reserve. Run-off from the development onto the CWS may be an issue and will need to be mitigated for.</p>		<p>Biodiversity Net gain requirement will be covered by Strategic policy and will apply to all sites</p> <p>The site now has planning permission.</p>	
Norwich Apex Limited/ Lanpro Services Ltd	Support	On behalf of Norwich Apex Limited (owners of Apex Business Park). Norwich Apex secured planning permission for Apex Business Park in 2018 from South Norfolk Council (2017/2794) and are currently assembling the required infrastructure for the site (including the		Support noted. The KES2 allocation is carried forward on the boundary of planning permission 2017/2794 which incorporate site GNLP0497.	None

		access, link road and strategic landscaping). Norwich Apex fully support this proposed policy allocation. The land presents the opportunity to provide additional employment floorspace in a sustainable location and in a sustainable manner and contribute to the challenge of providing jobs growth in the Greater Norwich Area over the plan period.			
Keswick and Intwood Parish Council	Object	<p>Keswick and Intwood PC believes no further approval should be granted until:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the impact (visually and environmentally) of the current development can be assessed and its effect on Keswick village; • the commercial success of the site can be judged in relation to other space available; • the suitability of the road infrastructure to cope with traffic created is evaluated and especially 		Comments noted but the site now has planning consent (reference 2017/2794) on a larger boundary that incorporates site GNLP0497. The carried forward allocation will be redrawn accordingly.	None

		<p>the Low Road traffic scheme;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is evidence justification for the need of future employment land; • the material benefits of the job creation is shown to outweigh the adverse impact on the local area. 			
Historic England	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the grade II listed church of all Saints and remains of the Church of All Saints lies to the west of the site. Any development has the potential to impact upon the setting of these designated heritage assets. There is currently no mention of these assets within the policy or of the need to conserve and where appropriate enhance the significance of these nearby heritage assets.</p> <p>Suggested Change: Amend policy to include reference to the grade II</p>		It is accepted that the policy should acknowledge the potential for harm to the heritage assets and the requirement for measure to address this.	Amend Site Policy for KES2 to read: ‘Any development must conserve and enhance the significance of nearby heritage assets including the grade II listed church of All Saints and remains of the Church of All Saints to the west of the site, including any contribution made to that

		listed Church and remains of church and the need to conserve and where appropriate enhance the significance of these heritage assets.			significance by setting'.
--	--	---	--	--	---------------------------

Cringleford (including employment land at Keswick) – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0461 Land off Gurney Lane, Cringleford (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Cringleford Parish Council	Support	Cringleford Parish Council is generally supportive of the plan for the Parish, and the uplift within the settlement boundary. Furthermore, it is grateful for the continued recognition of some sensitive sites that have been designated unreasonable		Comment noted	None

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP3047 A140/Mulbarton Road, Keswick (Unreasonable Non-Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Lanpro Services Ltd	Object	The site is in a sustainable location and represents an important employment opportunity that should be included in the GNLP. We provide evidence that there will be clear demand for this site over the plan period and that it is needed to meet the growth ambitions of the plan.	Consider evidence presented	This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as evidence suggests that currently committed land is more than sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the employment growth needs in Greater Norwich. There is therefore no need to allocate any additional large-scale employment	None

				sites in the new local plan.	
--	--	--	--	---------------------------------	--

DRAYTON

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	DRAYTON OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	4
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comments

Drayton has 0 preferred sites, 1 carried forward/uplift allocation policy (DRA1) , 0 reasonable alternative sites and 0 unreasonable sites.

Main issues

Drayton – No Reasonable Alternatives (General Comments)

- Member of the Public - The proposal for this site has been in place for several years. Would like to see it built now as suggest it will enhance the village.

Policy DRA1 Land east of Cator Road and North of Hall Lane, Drayton (Carried Forward Allocation)

- Historic England – Suggested Changes: Include reference to the listed buildings and the need to conserve and where appropriate enhance them.
- Member of the public – Suggest that building work does not commence until the Northern Broadway (NDR) has been completed. Also, that the traffic calming measure on Carter Road is put in place.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites:

- GNLP0270
- GNLP0271
- GNLP0289
- GNLP0290
- GNLP0301
- GNLP0329
- GNLP2027

Unreasonable Non-Residential Sites:

- GNLP0465

Drayton – General Comments

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Drayton – No Reasonable Alternatives (General Comments)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Member of the Public	Support	The proposal for this site has been in place for several years. Would like to see it built now as suggest it will enhance the village.		Comment noted	None

Drayton – Carried Forward Allocation

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy DRA1 Land east of Cator Road and North of Hall Lane, Drayton (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comments

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Member of the public	Comment	Suggestion that building work does not commence until the Northern Broadway (NDR) has been completed, linked directly to the A47 towards King Lynn. Also, that the traffic calming measure on Carter Road is put in place.		Comment noted	None
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed.	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all	None

		allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2.		sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy	
Historic England	Object	Suggested Changes: Include reference to the listed building and the need to conserve and where appropriate enhance them Suggested wording: Development should conserve or where appropriate enhance the significance of the grade II listed 4 Manor Farm Close (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset) through appropriate landscaping, setback and design		It is accepted that the policy should acknowledge the potential for harm to the heritage assets and the requirement for measure to address this.	Add policy requirement to DRA1 to read: 'Any development must conserve and enhance the significance of the grade II listed 4 Manor Farm Close including any contribution made to that significance by setting. This includes but is not limited to appropriate landscaping, setback and design.

EASTON AND HONINGHAM

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	EASTON AND HONINGHAM OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	86
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	10 Support, 66 Object, 10 Comment

Easton and Honingham has 1 preferred site, 1 carried forward / uplift allocation, 1 reasonable alternative site and 2 unreasonable sites.

Main issues

Site GNLP2176 Land North of Dereham Road, Honingham (Preferred Site)

- Member of the public – There would be immense detrimental impact to a village that is currently deprived of utilities, medical and education 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.
- Bidwells on behalf of the Rampton Property Trust – Strongly support the preferred option. The site is entirely deliverable, and capable of making a significant contribution towards satisfying the Councils housing needs during the period to 2038.
- Members of the public - Support 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 issue. 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.

- Members of the public – Object as 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 services are limited and cannot be relied upon for commuting. Brownfield sites in Norwich are far better placed for this allocation. Few job opportunities so workers would need to commute. This will lead to more housing, potential effect on wildlife, crime, pressure on roads, drainage. This land should be retained for food production.

Policy EAS1 Land south and east of Easton (Carried Forward Allocation and Uplift)

- John Long Planning/ Persimmons Homes supports the site as capable of accommodating additional homes beyond those identified in the previous Plan (900) and as permitted by the outline consent (890) and likely to be permitted (64). However, it is not appropriate for the Policy to ignore the fact that many of the Policy's requirements are met through the consent planning conditions and accompanying S106 agreement. Also, the housing figure should be expressed as a minimum.
- Easton Parish Council – The land suggested for 90 houses is in the process of being sold to Norfolk County Council for use as a Special Education Needs school and as such EAS1 cannot accommodate these extra 90 homes.
- Historic England - Suggest that the policy is improved by adding 'Development should conserve or where appropriate enhance the significance of the grade I listed Church of St Peter (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset) and ensure that sufficient open space'.
- Members of the public – Object as this is too much for a small village to accommodate. No infrastructure, public transport, not on fine agricultural land when there are more appropriate, larger sites elsewhere. This will lead to congestion, increased air pollution, damage to wildlife, destruction of the rural countryside.

Site GNLP0415R-A-G Honingham Thorpe - Strategic mixed-use development consisting of residential development, employment, country park and nature reserve (Reasonable Alternative Site) Garden Village 5,000 Dwellings

- Honingham Parish Council – Object as far too large, would swamp the countryside and develop huge urban sprawl. No infrastructure, maybe a reasonable alternative in 50 years time.

- Members of the Public – Object as this scale of development would have a detrimental effect on a large surrounding area. These sites are proposed on irreplaceable prime agricultural land. A development of this scale should only be part of the city of Norwich not annexed in the countryside. Concern over the lack of facilities including doctors, shop, bus service, etc. Potential impact on existing infrastructure, wildlife, etc. Duelling of the Western link is necessary but not the Garden Village.
- Environment Agency – comments about the classification of flood zones

Site GNLP0456 Land off A47, Easton (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Easton Parish Council – 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.
- Members of the Public – Concern over the potential impact on the village, wildlife, lack of infrastructure.

Site GNLP0411 Land at Fellowes Road, Honingham (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- 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.
- Members of the Public - Support - Small land area on a slope, once concreted over all the water that would have been absorbed will wash into Mill Lane flooding homes and the unmade up 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.
- Brown & Co - 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.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Easton and Honingham – Preferred Site

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 services. No shop, limited bus service and an		Numerous objections were received to this site through the consultation. The site was initially preferred for	Site allocation removed

		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.		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 contribution towards satisfying the Councils		Support noted, however numerous objections were received to this site through the consultation. The site was initially preferred for	Site allocation removed

		<p>housing needs during the period to 2038. It is recognised that more homes may be accommodated on the site, subject to an acceptable design and layout, as well.</p>		<p>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>	
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 issue.</p>		<p>Support noted, however numerous objections were received to this site through the consultation. The site was initially preferred for</p>	<p>Site allocation removed</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>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>	
<p>Various members of the public</p>	<p>Object</p>	<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 services are limited and cannot be relied upon for</p>		<p>Numerous objections were received to this site through the consultation. The site was initially preferred for allocation given the</p>	<p>Site allocation removed</p>

		<p>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>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>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Easton and Honingham – Carried Forward Allocation/Uplift

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy EAS1 Land south and east of Easton (Carried Forward Allocation and Uplift)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	11
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 8 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
John Long Planning Persimmons Homes	Support	Persimmon Homes (Anglia) supports the site capable of accommodating additional homes beyond those identified in the previous Plan (900) and as permitted by the outline consent (890) and likely to be permitted (64). However, it is not appropriate for the Policy to ignore the fact that many of the Policy's requirements are met		Support noted. It is recognised that some of the policy requirements will have already been met through the planning consent. Supporting text to be amended to reflect this.	Amend supporting text to refer to the fact that a number of policy requirements will have already been met through the planning consent on the site.

		through the consent planning conditions and accompanying S106 agreement. Also, the housing figure should be expressed as a minimum.			
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2.	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed.	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy	None
Easton Parish Council	Object	The land suggested for 90 houses is in the process of being sold to Norfolk County Council for use as a Special Education Needs school and as such EAS1 cannot accommodate these extra 90 homes.	Follow up with Development Management officers	Comment noted – It is considered that there is capacity for an additional 90 dwellings on the last parcel of allocated land, to the east of Easton Gymnastics Club	None
Historic England	Object	We note that this is a carried forward allocation and so the principle of development has already been established. We welcome criteria 7 and 8 which refer to heritage assets.		It is accepted that the policy should acknowledge the potential for harm to the heritage assets and the requirement for measure to address this.	Add policy requirement to EAS1 to read: 'Any development must conserve and enhance the significance of the grade I listed Church of

		<p>Suggest that the policy is improved by adding the following at the start of criterion 8</p> <p>Suggested Changes: Development should conserve or where appropriate enhance the significance of the grade I listed Church of St Peter (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset) and ensure that sufficient open space and landscaping is retained to the south, south east and south west of St Peter's Church and that sufficient planting is provided, such that its setting, and the wooded setting of Diocesan House and the Vicarage, are protected.</p>			<p>St Peter including any contribution made to that significance by setting. This includes but is not limited to ensuring that sufficient open space and landscaping is retained to the south, south east and south west of St Peter's Church and that sufficient planting is provided, such that its setting, and the wooded setting of Diocesan House and the Vicarage, are protected</p>
Members of the public	Object	<p>This is too much for a small village to accommodate. No infrastructure, public</p>		<p>Comments noted but the principal of the allocation has already been</p>	<p>None</p>

		transport, not on fine agricultural land when there are more appropriate, larger sites elsewhere. This will lead to congestion, increased air pollution, damage to wildlife, destruction of the rural countryside.		agreed through the South Norfolk Local Plan and as the site now has outline planning permission it is considered to be appropriate to carry forward into this plan.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Easton and Honingham – Reasonable Alternative Site

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		There are currently no proposals to	None

		<p>effect on a large surrounding area as 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>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</p>	
Environment Agency	Comment	<p>GNLP0415R-E and GNLP0415R-F Allocations adjacent to the River Yare of a nature</p>		<p>There are currently no proposals to allocate a new settlement in the</p>	None

		<p>reserve and Country Park are welcomed.</p> <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</p>		<p>local plan, however GNLP0415 is being considered within the context of options for a new settlement in the future</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>under Amenity open space, nature conservation 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>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

Easton and Honingham – Unreasonable Sites

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		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	None

		their design plans for the A47 improvements in this area.		allocation at the current time.	
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	
--	--	---	--	--	--

HELLESDON

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	HELLESDON OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	92
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	40 Support, 43 Object, 9 Comment

Hellesdon has 0 preferred sites, 4 carried forward/uplift allocations, 2 reasonable alternative sites, and 1 unreasonable site.

Main issues

Policy HEL1 Land at Hospital Grounds, southwest of Drayton Road, Hellesdon (Carried Forward Allocation)

- Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust / Bidwells - On behalf of Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust , we strongly support the allocation of Hellesdon Hospital under Policy HEL1 for residential and employment uses.

Policy HEL2 Land at the Royal Norwich Golf Club, either side of Drayton High Road, Hellesdon (Carried Forward Allocation)

- Hellesdon Neighbourhood Group – It is important that there is consultation with the local parish council in order to consider the Hellesdon Neighbourhood Plan when designing subsequent phases of this development.
- Persimmon Homes (Anglia Region) /John Long Planning - Policy should take into account Master Plan currently being revised to take account of additional requirements not anticipated by previous allocation and existing legal agreements for instance provision of school etc.

Policy HEL4 / Site GNLP1019 Land northeast of Reepham Road (Carried Forward Allocation)

- Individual – Due to the location of HEL4 this allocation cannot fulfil its intention for open space. It is remote from the centre of Hellesdon and only residents on the northern boundary can access it easily, there is currently no provision for parking (and there is not likely to be due to the necessary costs).
- CODE Development Planners Ltd – The landowners object to the allocation of 11.08 hectares for recreational open space.

Site GNLP1021 Rear of Heath Crescent, Prince Andrews Road, Hellesdon (Reasonable Alternative Site)

*This site is also being considered for residential uses by landowner See GNLP 2173

- Hellesdon Parish Council - There is clear support from the community and robust evidence demonstrating an undersupply of formal and informal open space at Hellesdon. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to allocate this site for open space and suggest that BDC could assist through compulsory purchase of the land from Jarrolds.
- Members of the Public (various) - Support for the Open Space at this location in order to play bowls, football, tennis, running etc. This is an area of extensive growth therefore, open space would be widely needed. There is wide support for mental health and by utilising this land for open space it supports this objective.

Site GNLP2173 Rear of Heath Crescent, Hellesdon (Reasonable Alternative Site)

Also being considered for Leisure purposes – see GNLP1021

- CODE Development Planners Ltd on behalf of Jarrolds and Sons the owners of the site. Redevelopment of the site closed for open space in 2016 would provide new homes to serve the need of the community.
- Members of the public (various) – Numerous objections for the redevelopment of this site due to the potential loss of open space and associated benefits including wellbeing etc.
- Individual - The site should be retained for open space for the enjoyment of the residents on the eastern side of Hellesdon as residents would need to cross two major roads to access leisure facilities.

Site GNLP2142 West of Hellesdon Park Industrial Estate, Hellesdon (Unreasonable Non-Residential Site)

Brown & Co - The site provides an opportunity to provide a sustainable employment area that would complement the existing industrial estate to the east

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Carried Forward Allocations

- Policy HEL2/ GNLP1020

Hellesdon – Carried Forward Allocations

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy HEL1 Land at Hospital Grounds, southwest of Drayton Road, Hellesdon (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust	Support	On behalf of Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust (the Trust), we strongly support the allocation of Hellesdon Hospital under Policy HEL1 for residential and employment uses. The site is entirely deliverable, and capable of making a significant contribution towards satisfying the Councils' housing needs during the period to 2038		Support noted	None

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy HEL2 Land at the Royal Norwich Golf Club, either side of Drayton High Road, Hellesdon (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Hellesdon Neighbourhood Group	Comment	It is important that there is consultation with the local parish council in order to consider the Hellesdon Neighbourhood Plan when designing subsequent phases of this development.		Comment noted	None
Persimmon Homes (Anglia Region)/ John Long Planning	Support	Policy should take into account Master Plan currently being revised to take account of additional requirements not anticipated by previous allocation and existing legal agreements for		Support noted	None

		instance provision of school etc.			
--	--	-----------------------------------	--	--	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy HEL4 / Site GNLP1019 Land northeast of Reepham Road (Carried Forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Individual	Comment	Due to the location of HEL4 this allocation cannot fulfil its intention for open space. It is remote from the centre of Hellesdon and only residents on the northern boundary can access it easily, there is currently no provision for parking (and there is not likely to be due to the necessary costs). If HEL4 is to be counted as allocation for recreational open space then it must serve the majority of the		Hellesdon has an identified need for open space, this is a carried forward site adopted through the 2016 Broadland Local Plan therefore no changes are proposed .	None

		parish, much of which is over 1.5 miles distant. It is irresponsible to create a green space which you then need to use the car to drive to!			
CODE Development Planners Ltd	Object	<p>The landowners object to the allocation of 11.08 hectares for recreational open space.</p> <p>In our view, unless and until appropriate evidence is prepared, the draft allocation for recreational open space on 11.08 hectares of land at Reepham Road should be deleted. The landowners continue to encourage dialogue with all relevant parties, including the parish councils in order to identify the most appropriate provision of recreational open space to meet the requirements of various forms of outdoor recreation.</p>		<p>Hellesdon has an identified need for open space, this is a carried forward site adopted through the 2016 Broadland Local Plan therefore no changes are proposed .</p>	None

Hellesdon – Reasonable Alternative Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP1021 Rear of Health Crescent, Prince Andrews Road, Hellesdon (Reasonable Alternative Site) *This site is also being considered for residential uses by landowner See GNLP 2173
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	40
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	37 Support, 0 Object, 3 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Members of the Public (various)	Support	Support for the Open Space at this location in order to play bowls, football, tennis, running etc. This is an area of extensive growth therefore; open space would be widely needed. There is wide support for mental health and by utilising this land for open space it supports this objective.	Consider competing proposals for housing and open space on the site in the context the need for additional open space in Hellesdon	This proposal was considered as a reasonable alternative through the Regulation 18C consultation alongside alternative plans for residential use put forward by the landowner to allow for further consideration of both proposals.	None

				<p>The decision has been taken not to allocate either site and leave it as 'white land' within the settlement boundary to be dealt with through the planning or Neighbourhood Plan process. The need for open space in Hellesdon presented by the Parish Council is recognised but there does not seem to be any agreement between the Parish Council and the landowner about the future use of the site so the delivery for open space cannot be guaranteed.</p>	
Hellesdon Parish Council	Support	There is clear support from the community and robust evidence demonstrating an undersupply of formal and informal open space at	Consider competing proposals for housing and open space on the site in the context the need for	This proposal was considered as a reasonable alternative through the Regulation 18C	None

		<p>Hellesdon. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to allocate this site for open space and suggest that BDC could assist through compulsory purchase of the land from Jarrolds.</p>	<p>additional open space in Hellesdon</p>	<p>consultation alongside alternative plans for residential use put forward by the landowner to allow for further consideration of both proposals. The decision has been taken not to allocate either site and leave it as 'white land' within the settlement boundary to be dealt with through the planning or Neighbourhood Plan process. The need for open space in Hellesdon presented by the Parish Council is recognised but there does not seem to be any agreement between the Parish Council and the landowner about the future use of</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

				the site so the delivery for open space cannot be guaranteed.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2173 Rear of Heath Crescent, Hellesdon (Reasonable Alternative Site) Also being considered for Leisure purposes – see GNLP1021
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	45
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 42 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
CODE Development Planners Ltd	Support	On behalf of Jarrolds and Sons the owners of the site. Redevelopment of the site closed for open space in 2016 would provide new homes to serve the need of the community.	Consider competing proposals for housing and open space on the site in the context the need for additional open space in Hellesdon	This proposal was considered as a reasonable alternative through the Regulation 18C consultation alongside alternative plans for residential use put forward by the landowner to allow for further consideration of both proposals.	None

				<p>The decision has been taken not to allocate either site and leave it as 'white land' within the settlement boundary to be dealt with through the planning or Neighbourhood Plan process. The need for open space in Hellesdon presented by the Parish Council is recognised but there does not seem to be any agreement between the Parish Council and the landowner about the future use of the site so the delivery for open space cannot be guaranteed.</p>	
Members of the public (various)	Object	Numerous objections for the redeveloped of this site due to the potential loss of open space and associated benefits	Consider competing proposals for housing and open space on the site in the context the need for	This proposal was considered as a reasonable alternative through the Regulation 18C	None

		including wellbeing etc. Not to mention the loss of the Golf course to residential development and other sites nearby.	additional open space in Hellesdon	consultation alongside alternative plans for residential use put forward by the landowner to allow for further consideration of both proposals. The decision has been taken not to allocate either site and leave it as 'white land' within the settlement boundary to be dealt with through the planning or Neighbourhood Plan process. The need for open space in Hellesdon presented by the Parish Council is recognised but there does not seem to be any agreement between the Parish Council and the landowner about the future use of	
--	--	--	------------------------------------	--	--

				the site so the delivery for open space cannot be guaranteed.	
Individual	Comment	The site should be retained for open space for the enjoyment of the residents on the eastern side of Hellesdon as residents would need to cross two major roads to access leisure facilities.	Consider competing proposals for housing and open space on the site in the context the need for additional open space in Hellesdon	This proposal was considered as a reasonable alternative through the Regulation 18C consultation alongside alternative plans for residential use put forward by the landowner to allow for further consideration of both proposals. The decision has been taken not to allocate either site and leave it as 'white land' within the settlement boundary to be dealt with through the planning or Neighbourhood Plan process. The need for open space in Hellesdon presented by the	None

				Parish Council is recognised but there does not seem to be any agreement between the Parish Council and the landowner about the future use of the site so the delivery for open space cannot be guaranteed.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Hellesdon – Unreasonable Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2142 West of Hellesdon Park Industrial Estate, Hellesdon (Unreasonable Non-Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Brown & Co	Object	The site provides an opportunity to provide a sustainable employment area that would complement the existing industrial estate to the east. It would provide a range of units to encourage start-up business as well as the opportunity for existing		This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as evidence suggests that currently committed land is more than sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the employment growth	None

		<p>business to move to larger premises. The site is situated within the built-up area of Hellesdon and within easy reach of residential, commercial and retail uses. Development would provide community benefits through a community woodland and extension to the burial ground.</p>		<p>needs in Greater Norwich.</p>	
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------	--

RACKHEATH

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	RACKHEATH OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	14
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 3 Object, 9 Comment

Rackheath has 2 preferred sites, 0 carried forward/uplift allocations, 0 reasonable alternatives and 8 unreasonable sites.

Main issues

Site GNLP0172 Land to the west of Green Lane West, Rackheath (Preferred Site)

- Carter Jonas LLP - Taylor Wimpey East Anglia control land to the west of Green Lane West in Rackheath. An outline planning application for 205 dwellings has been submitted for the promoted development (Ref. 2017/2208). This site has a resolution to grant planning permission and the S106 Agreement has been signed.
- Historic England - Amend policy to state that land to the west of the A1270 should only be used for open space to conserve and where opportunities arise enhance the significance of the grade II listed Rackheath Hall and bridge.

Site GNLP0351 Land at Heathwood Gospel Hall, Green Lane West, Rackheath (Preferred Site)

- None

Site GNLP0095 Land to the east of Salhouse Road, Rackheath (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Rackheath Parish Council - Salhouse Road sites will only be supported if the road is widened, speed reduced to 40mph, rapid transport route implemented along Salhouse Road and connected to the city, direct cycle route to link Thorpe End, Salhouse and Sprowston and woodland planting on boundaries and existing woodland area. Developments should link to communities and commuter routes. Access to the NDR is challenging enough already.
- GP Planning Ltd – Landowner objects to the site being unreasonable. This is a small site proposed for up to 8 dwellings. The site is considered sufficiently far from Rackheath Hall to not cause significant impact. Access can readily be achieved from Salhouse Road.

Site GNLP1029 Land east of Back Lane, Rackheath (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Rackheath Parish Council - Object due to the scale being out of proportion for the area. The site is located over 3km from the school with poor cycle and path access across a very busy road.

Site GNLP1060 Land to the south of Swash Lane and Muck Lane, Rackheath (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Rackheath Parish Council would prefer to see this site used for recreational use instead of housing as there is already a large housing supply allocated for Rackheath e.g. GT16.

Site GNLP2037 North east of Green Lane West, Rackheath (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- GP Planning Ltd - The promoters of the site support the conclusions in assessment. It is noted that the site is unlikely to be able to accommodate the minimum level of development. Also suggests that there is potential for the site, with sympathetic design, to accommodate greater than 10 units but would not wish the development of the site to be prejudiced without an allocation status.
- Rackheath Parish Council - No objection as it is in the village and front facing properties would be in keeping with the feel of the village and adjacent properties.

Site GNLP2092 South of Salhouse Road, Rackheath (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Rackheath Parish Council - No objection as it is in the village and front facing properties would be in keeping with the feel of the village and adjacent properties.
- Rackheath Parish Council - Salhouse Road sites will only be supported if the road is widened, speed reduced to 40mph, rapid transport route implemented along Salhouse Road and connected to the city, direct cycle route to link Thorpe End, Salhouse and Sprowston and woodland planting on boundaries and existing woodland area. Developments should link to communities and commuter routes. Access to the NDR is challenging enough already.

Site GNLP2166 Land at South of Warren Road, Rackheath (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Rackheath Parish Council - Objection due to the scale being out of proportion for the area. The site is located over 3km from the school with poor cycle and path access across a very busy road.
- Rackheath Parish Council - Salhouse Road sites will only be supported if the road is widened, speed reduced to 40mph, rapid transport route implemented along Salhouse Road and connected to the city, direct cycle route to link Thorpe End, Salhouse and Sprowston and woodland planting on boundaries and existing woodland area. Developments should link to communities and commuter routes. Access to the NDR is challenging enough already.
- Lanpro Services Ltd - Site is considered to be suitable for residential development, and it doesn't generate any significant harm that could not be dealt with during the normal course of preparing a planning application.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP0478
- GNLP1030

Rackheath – Preferred Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0172 Land to the west of Green Lane West, Rackheath (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2.	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed.	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy	None
Carter Jonas LLP	Support	Taylor Wimpey East Anglia control land to the west of Green Lane West in Rackheath. An outline planning application for 205 dwellings has been submitted for the promoted		Considering the site now has a resolution to grant planning permission and the S106 agreement has been signed it	Amend policy to refer to 205 dwellings to reflect planning permission

		<p>development (Ref. 2017/2208). This site has a resolution to grant planning permission and the S106 Agreement has been signed.</p> <p>In conclusion, it is requested that. GNLP0172) is retained as an allocation .</p>		<p>seems reasonable to revise the allocation to 205 dwellings to reflect the planning permission.</p>	
Historic England	Object	<p>The reference to Rackheath Hall is welcomed, the need for open space to be provided in the land to the west of the A1270. This requirement should be included in the policy</p> <p>Suggested Change: Amend policy to state that land to the west of the A1270 should only be used for open space to conserve and where opportunities arise enhance the significance of the grade II listed Rackheath Hall and bridge.</p>		<p>It is accepted that the policy should acknowledge the potential for harm to the heritage assets and the requirement for measure to address this.</p>	<p>Amend policy GNLP0172 to state: Land to the west of the A1270 should only be used for open space to conserve and where opportunities arise enhance the significance of the grade II listed Rackheath Hall and bridge’.</p>

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:		Site GNLP0351 Land at Heathwood Gospel Hall, Green Lane West, Rackheath (Preferred Site)			
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:		1			
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:		0 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment			
RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2.	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed.	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy	None.

Rackheath – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0095 Land to the east of Salhouse Road, Rackheath (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Rackheath Parish Council	Comment	Salhouse Road sites will only be supported if the road is widened, speed reduced to 40mph, rapid transport route implemented along Salhouse Road and connected to the city, direct cycle route to link Thorpe End, Salhouse and Sprowston and woodland planting on boundaries and existing woodland area. Developments should link		Comment noted	None

		to communities and commuter routes. Access to the NDR is challenging enough already.			
GP Planning Ltd	Object	The landowner OBJECTS to it being considered unreasonable. This is a small site proposed for up to 8 dwellings. The site is considered sufficiently far from Rackheath Hall to not cause significant impact. Access can readily be achieved from Salhouse Road.		This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as it is located within land designated as a landscape buffer to the Broadland Northway and it is close to Rackheath Hall and its historic gardens with likely landscape character and heritage impacts. Access to facilities is poor, Rackheath Primary School is located on the other side of the Broadland Northway with no safe walking route available.	None

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP1029 Land east of Back Lane, Rackheath (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Rackheath Parish Council	Comment	Objection due to the scale being out of proportion for the area. It's located at the edge of our boundary with poor access to the community centre. The location is over 3km from the school with poor cycle and path access across a very busy road.		Comment noted	None

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP1060 Land to the south of Swash Lane and Muck Lane, Rackheath (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Rackheath Parish Council	Comment	Parish Council would prefer to see this site used for recreational use instead of housing as there is already a large housing supply allocated for Rackheath e.g. GT16.		Comment noted	None

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2037 North east of Green Lane West, Rackheath (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
GP Planning Ltd	Support	The promoters of the site SUPPORT the conclusions in assessment. It is noted that the site is unlikely to be able to accommodate the minimum level of development. Also suggests that there is potential for the site, with sympathetic design, to accommodate greater than 10 units but would not wish the development of the site to be prejudiced without an allocation status.		Comment noted	None

Rackheath Parish Council	Comment	No objection as it is in the village and front facing properties would be in keeping with the feel of the village and adjacent properties.		Comment noted	None
--------------------------	---------	--	--	---------------	------

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2092 South of Salhouse Road, Rackheath (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 2 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Rackheath Parish Council	Comment	No objection as it is in the village and front facing properties would be in keeping with the feel of the village and adjacent properties.		Comment noted	None
Rackheath Parish Council	Comment	Salhouse Road sites will only be supported if the road is widened, speed reduced to 40mph, rapid transport route implemented along Salhouse Road and connected to the city, direct cycle route to link Thorpe End, Salhouse and		Comment noted	None

		Sprowston and woodland planting on boundaries and existing woodland area. Developments should link to communities and commuter routes. Access to the NDR is challenging enough already.			
--	--	---	--	--	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2166 Land at South of Warren Road, Rackheath (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Rackheath Parish Council	Comment	Objection due to the scale being out of proportion for the area. It's located at the edge of our boundary with poor access to the community centre. The location is over 3km from the school with poor cycle and path access across a very busy road.		Comment noted	None
Rackheath Parish Council	Comment	Salhouse Road sites will only be supported if the road is widened, speed reduced to 40mph, rapid transport route implemented along		Comment noted	None

		Salhouse Road and connected to the city, direct cycle route to link Thorpe End, Salhouse and Sprowston and woodland planting on boundaries and existing woodland area. Developments should link to communities and commuter routes. Access to the NDR is challenging enough already.			
Lanpro Services Ltd	Object	Site is considered to be suitable for residential development, and it doesn't generate any significant harm that could not be dealt with during the normal course of preparing a planning application.		This site is considered to be unsuitable for allocation as it is located within land allocated as a landscape buffer to the Broadland Northway and close to Rackheath Hall and its historic gardens with likely landscape character and heritage impacts. Access to facilities is poor, Rackheath Primary School is located on the other side of the	None

				Broadland Northway with no safe walking route available.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

SPROWSTON

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	SPROWSTON OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	17
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	7 Support, 4 Object, 6 Comment

Sprowston has 1 preferred site, 0 carried forward/uplift allocations, 2 reasonable alternatives and 2 unreasonable sites.

Main issues

Sprowston – Site Assessment Booklet (General Comments)

- Sprowston Town Council correction on a number of factual inaccuracies in the "draft gnlp sites, sprowston site assessment booklet

Site GNLP0132 Land off Blue Boar Lane/Salhouse Road, White House Farm, Sprowston (Preferred Site).

- Sprowston Town Council support that this site should be classified as a preferred residential site
- Hopkins Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey / Bidwells Support the preferred allocation of GNLP0132, Policy wording should be adjusted to indicate that 1200 units is a minimum figure, and flexibility introduced in relation to affordable housing.

- Mr Oliver Gurney on behalf of client at White House Farm supports this proposed housing allocation. It will be important to secure a strategic buffer around White House Farm in the masterplan proposals for this allocation.
- Historic England - Although Rackheath Hall, grade II listed lies to the east of the site, the intervening vegetation should provide a suitable buffer. Welcome the reference to the historic parkland and need for protection of trees in bullet point 5.
- Norfolk Wildlife Trust - This site includes an area of ancient woodland in the south-west corner of the proposed allocation. This area should be safeguarded through sufficient buffering It should be accompanied by an ecological appraisal, with provision of biodiversity net gain (potentially also delivering contributions to green infrastructure).
- Environment Agency - Sites such as this which intersect watercourses should undertake a WFD compliance assessment for the watercourse receiving the runoff, maintain a buffer of 20 m between the watercourse and gardens and secure opportunities for riparian habitat restoration.
- The Woodland Trust - Concerned about the potentially adverse impacts in relation to an area of ancient woodland known as Bulmer Coppice.

Site GNLP0383 Sprowston Park and Ride (High School or redevelopment for housing if a school is not required).

(Reasonable Non-Residential Alternative)

- Sprowston Town Council - If the site is not to be redeveloped for a new school it should be allocated for civic use, and not (as proposed in the draft) for housing.

Site GNLP3024 White House Farm, Sprowston (Multi use Community Hub) (Reasonable Alternative – Non-Residential Site)

- Sprowston Town Council support that this site should be classified as a reasonable alternative non-residential site.
- Mr Oliver Gurney/La Ronde Wright on behalf of client support reasonable alternative for multi -use hub. Currently a thriving hub of local businesses (planning application No. 20160106).
- Environment Agency - This site intersects watercourses therefore, should undertake a WFD compliance assessment for the watercourse receiving the runoff, maintain a buffer of 20 m between the watercourse and gardens and secure opportunities for riparian habitat restoration.

Site GNLP0042 Land at Rear of Hill Farm House, Wroxham Road, Sprowston (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Sprowston Town Council support that this site should be classified as an unreasonable residential site. It is remote, outside the current settlement boundary and not well served by public transport or other necessary infrastructure.
- Arnold Keys on behalf of clients - We seek the identification of site GNLP0042 (Land at rear of Hill Farmhouse, Wroxham Road) as a 'Preferred Housing Allocation' in the GNLP. An HELAA RAG assessment has been undertaken to demonstrate that the site is available, achievable and suitable for allocation.

Site GNLP2178 Lushers Loke, Sprowston (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Sprowston Town Council objects to this site being classified as unreasonable and fully supports its inclusion instead as a preferred residential site.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Sprowston – General Comments

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Sprowston – Site Assessment Booklet (General Comments)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 1 comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Sprowston Town Council	Comment	Correction on a number of factual inaccuracies in the "draft gnlp sites, sprowston site assessment booklet : Sprowston has three wards not two as stated, there is not a designated district centre housing allocations <u>were</u> included in the Sprowston Neighbourhood Plan - See Policy 18.		Take account of comments when updating the site assessment booklet	Amend the Sprowston site assessment booklet as appropriate

Sprowston – Preferred Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0132 Land off Blue Boar Lane/Salhouse Road, White House Farm, Sprowston (Preferred Site).
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	9
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	4 Support, 1 Object, 4 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Sprowston Town Council	Support	Supports that this site should be classified as a preferred residential site		Support noted	None
Hopkins Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey Bidwells	Support	Support the preferred allocation of GNLP0132, Land off Blue Boar Lane/Salhouse Road, White House Farm, Sprowston. Policy wording should be adjusted to indicate that 1200 units is a minimum figure, and flexibility		Support noted Correct errors identified in the policy	Update policy wording as appropriate.

		introduced in relation to affordable housing. In all other respects, the requirements of the policy are considered generally appropriate. For accuracy, in the second bullet point, 'Mallard Way' should be replaced with 'Atlantic Avenue'. Similarly, the final bullet point contains a typing error and the word 'approached' should be replaced with 'approved'.			
Mr Oliver Gurney/ Mrs Nicole Wright	Support	On behalf of client White House Farm supports this proposed housing allocation. It will be important to secure a strategic buffer around White House Farm in the masterplan proposals for this allocation.		Comment noted. The additional buffer is not considered appropriate or justifiable. The matter is adequately addressed by Policy 3 (and policies in the Development Management DPD)	None
Historic England	Support	Although Rackheath Hall, grade II listed lies to the east of the site, the intervening vegetation		Comments noted	None

		should provide a suitable buffer. We welcome the reference to the historic parkland and need for protection of trees in bullet point 5.			
Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Comment	This site includes an area of ancient woodland in the south-west corner of the proposed allocation. This area should be safeguarded through sufficient buffering (at least 50m, preferably 100m, in line with Woodland Trust guidance). It should be accompanied by an ecological appraisal, with provision of biodiversity net gain (potentially also delivering contributions to green infrastructure).		Review policy wording to ensure area of Ancient woodland within the site is protected and safeguarded from development Provision of biodiversity net gain covered by strategic policies	Amend site policy as appropriate
Environment Agency	Comment	Sites such as this which intersect water courses should undertake a WFD compliance assessment for the watercourse receiving the runoff, maintain a buffer of 20 m between the watercourse and gardens and secure opportunities		Review policy wording	Add policy requirement to read: 'This site intersects watercourses so a WFD compliance assessment will be required for

		for riparian habitat restoration.			the watercourse receiving the runoff. A buffer of 20m will need to be maintained between the watercourse and gardens and opportunities for riparian habitat restoration should be secured'.
The Woodland Trust	Object	Concerned about the potentially adverse impacts will have in relation to an area of ancient woodland known as Bulmer Coppice. Ancient woodland should not be included in areas that are allocated for development, whether for residential, leisure or community purposes as this leaves them open to the impacts of development. For this reason, we believe the site is unsound and should not be taken forward.		The policy will be revised to take account of the area of Ancient Woodland within the site to ensure it is protected and safeguarded from development	Amend site policy as appropriate

Sprowston – Reasonable Alternative Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0383 Sprowston Park and Ride (High School or redevelopment for housing if a school is not required). (Reasonable Non-Residential Alternative)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Sprowston Town Council	Comment	If the site is not to be redeveloped for a new school it should be allocated for civic use, and not (as proposed in the draft) for housing.		The site is allocated for High School / Institutional Use in OSRT AAP and this plan is not superseding the AAP	None

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP3024 White House Farm, Sprowston (Multi use Community Hub) (Reasonable Alternative – Non-Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	2 Support, 0 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Sprowston Town Council	Support	Supports that this site should be classified as a reasonable alternative non-residential site.		Support noted however the site is not proposed to be allocated in the Regulation 19 version of the plan as there is insufficient evidence about the need for the proposal and how the development will come forward.	None

Mr Oliver Gurney/ Mrs Nicole Wright [14312]	Support	On behalf of client support reasonable alternative for multi -use hub. We currently have a thriving hub of local businesses (planning application No. 20160106). See full rep for details.		Support noted however the site is not proposed to be allocated in the Regulation 19 version of the plan as there is insufficient evidence about the need for the proposal and how the development will come forward.	None
Environment Agency	Comment	This site intersects water courses therefore, should undertake a WFD compliance assessment for the watercourse receiving the runoff, maintain a buffer of 20 m between the watercourse and gardens and secure opportunities for riparian habitat restoration.		Comments noted but it is not intended to allocate this site in the Regulation 19 version of the plan.	None

Sproston – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0042 Land at Rear of Hill Farm House, Wroxham Road, Sproston (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Sprowston Town Council	Support	Support that this site should be classified as an unreasonable residential site. As its too remote, outside the current settlement boundary, and not well served by public transport or other necessary infrastructure.		Comment noted	None
Arnold Keys on behalf of clients	Object	We seek the identification of site GNLP0042 (Land at rear of Hill Farmhouse,		This site is not considered to be suitable for	None

		<p>Wroxham Road) as a 'Preferred Housing Allocation' in the GNLP. An HELAA RAG assessment has been undertaken to demonstrate that the site is available, achievable and suitable for allocation.</p>		<p>allocation as it is located beyond the settlement and existing commitment. It is considered to be remote, disconnected from services and unsympathetic to the character of the area.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2178 Lushers Loke, Sprowston (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Sprowston Town Council	Object	OBJECTS to this site being classified as an UNREASONABLE RESIDENTIAL SITE Council strongly opposes the suggestion that this is an unreasonable site for residential development and fully supports its inclusion instead as a PREFERRED RESIDENTIAL SITE. For further info see additional info.		This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation due to concerns about road capacity and lack of footpath provision. There is also a high risk of surface water flooding in the south east portion of the site. As it is located within the built up area it could come forward through the	None

				planning application process.	
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------	--

TAVERHAM (AND RINGLAND)

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	TAVERHAM AND RINGLAND OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	27
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	3 Support, 10 Object, 14 Comment

Taverham and Ringland has 1 preferred site, 1 carried forward allocation, 1 reasonable alternatives site and 9 unreasonable sites.

Main issues

Site GNLP0337 Land between Fir Covert Road and Reepham Road, Taverham (Preferred Site) 1, 400 dwellings

- M Scott Properties Ltd/Bidwells strongly support the preferred allocation.
- Drayton Parish Council would like to ensure that facilities are available before 25% of the development is built.
- Members of the public - pleased to see access off Reepham Rd and Fir Covert Way and additional facilities included are noted. Neighbourhood Plan must be adhered to. Main concerns are, scale of development, potential flooding, additional traffic on to the A140 and A1067 to Norwich particularly with Norwich Golf Club developments. Development should not commence until the western link is completed.

Site GNLP0159 Land adjacent to Beech Avenue Business Park, Ringland Road, Taverham (Reasonable Alternative Site)

- Brown & Co - The classification of this site is a reasonable alternative is supported. However, it is sought to promote part of this larger site for a small residential development of circa. 9 dwellings, to be considered as part of the review into settlement boundaries.

Site GNLP0062 Field at Taverham Road, Taverham (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Members of the public - delighted that the views of local residents have been taken into account and that site GNLP0062 has been deemed unsuitable for development for the reasons given.

Site GNLP2051 151 Taverham Road, Taverham (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Members of the public - delighted that the views of local residents have been taken into account and that site GNLP0062 has been deemed unsuitable for development for the reasons given.
- The members of Taverham Road Action Group (TRAG) agree that site GNLP2051 is totally unsuitable for development and fully support the decision to recommend that it should be rejected as a possible site, along with two other sites that have been put forward in relation to the south side of Taverham Road.
- Site promoter objects to site being unreasonable. Further evidence provided to demonstrate new access, and other aspects.

Site GNLP2106 South of Taverham Road, Taverham (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Member of the public - Support the decision that the site is an unreasonable alternative, the proposed development would have had a detrimental effect on the Wensum Valley .

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP0457
- GNLP3039
- GNLP3040
- GNLP3043
- GNLP3045

Taverham and Ringland – Preferred Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0337 Land between Fir Covert Road and Reepham Road, Taverham (Preferred Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	16
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 8 Object, 7 Comments

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
M Scott Properties Ltd/ Bidwells	Support	On behalf of M Scott Properties Ltd (Scott Properties), we strongly support the preferred allocation. The Site is entirely deliverable, and capable of making a significant contribution towards satisfying the Councils housing needs during the period to 2038. The work undertaken to date is covered in more		Comment noted Consider additional evidence on delivery etc. as part of policy wording revisions.	None

		detail in the Delivery Statement prepared by Scott Properties and submitted in support of this representation See Appendix 1			
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2.	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed.	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy	None
Drayton Parish Council	Comment	<p>Drayton Parish Council would like to ensure more robust provision is included within the development so that these facilities are available before 25% of the development is built. The Parish Council would also like to ensure that no vehicular access is granted into the new development area from Felsham Way.</p> <p>Other concerns are: with increase in traffic numbers on Reepham Road towards Drayton and Hellesdon from the proposed vehicular access</p>		Comments noted. The policy states that the masterplan should set out the approach to phasing across the site. It also states that Felsham Way will be a pedestrian/cycle link	None

		point from the new development. Suggests a for a left turn only exist to encourage the use of Broadland Northway, the Norwich Western Link and the soon to be delivered duelled A47.			
Members of the public	Objection	Pleased to see access off Reepham Rd and Fir Covert Way and additional facilities included are noted. Neighbourhood Plan must be adhered to. Main concerns are, scale of development, potential flooding, additional traffic on to the A140 and A1067 to Norwich particularly with Norwich Golf Club developments. Opposed to community facilities suggested for the purposes of further development. Development should not commence until the western link is completed.		Comments noted The requirement to provide for housing needs through this plan may mean that development will commence on site prior to the completion of the western link.	None
NPS Property Consultants Ltd	Objection	Representing Norfolk Constabulary whose responsibility for policing and making Norfolk a safe		It has not been demonstrated that this requirement can be delivered so	None

		<p>place where people want to live, work, travel and invest in.</p> <p>Policy GNLP0337 will provide a very large urban extension at the edge of north west Norwich, the policy should also include a new police station. Therefore, the policy should be amended to include this requirement in requiring land to be safeguarded for provision of police station.</p>		<p>it is not intended to include it in the policy..</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Taverham and Ringland – Reasonable Alternative Site

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0159 Land adjacent to Beech Avenue Business Park, Ringland Road, Taverham (Reasonable Alternative Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Brown & Co	Support	The classification of this site as a reasonable alternative is supported. However, it is sought to promote part of this larger site for a small residential development of circa. 9 dwellings, to be considered as part of the review into settlement boundaries.		Following further consideration a small part of this site is considered suitable for allocation with access through the adjacent site which has planning permission.	Include as new site allocation for up to 12 dwellings

Taverham and Ringland – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0062 Field at Taverham Road, Taverham (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 3 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Members of the public	Comment	Resident delighted that the views of local residents have been taken into account and that site GNLP0062 has been deemed unsuitable for development for the reasons given.		Comment noted	None

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2051 151 Taverham Road, Taverham (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	5
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 4 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Members of the public	Comment	Resident delighted that the views of local residents have been taken into account and that site has been deemed unsuitable for development.		Comment noted	None
Taverham Road Action Group	Comment	The members of Taverham Road Action Group (TRAG) agree that site GNLP2051 is totally unsuitable for development and fully support the decision to recommend that it should be rejected as a possible site, along with two other sites that have been put forward in		Comment noted	None

		relation to the south side of Taverham Road.			
Site promoter	Object	Objects to site being unreasonable. Further evidence provided to demonstrate new access, and other aspects.		Further consideration has been given to additional evidence and alternative sites submitted but development in this location is still not considered to be suitable for access and landscape reasons.	No change

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2106 South of Taverham Road, Taverham (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Member of the public	Support	Fully in support the decision that site is an unreasonable alternative site, the proposed development would have had a detrimental effect on the Wensum Valley .		Comment noted	None

THORPE ST ANDREW

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	THORPE ST ANDREW OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	5
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	3 Support, 2 Object, 0 Comment

Thorpe St Andrew has 0 preferred sites, 0 carried forward/uplift allocations, 0 reasonable alternative sites and 5 unreasonable sites.

Main issues

Policy Site GNLP0442 Racecourse Plantations, Plumstead Road East, Thorpe St Andrew (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Member of the public – Support unreasonable classification as it is a woodland that surround the East side of Norwich

Policy Site GNLP2170 Langley North (Former Playing Fields/Langley School), Thorpe St Andrew (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Barton Willmore - Site benefits from outline planning approval for residential development, there is no evidence that development at this location would result in further deficiency of playing pitches.

Site GNLP2171 Langley South (Former Langley School), Thorpe St Andrew (Unreasonable Residential Site)

- Barton Willmore - Site benefits from outline planning approval for residential development, there is no evidence that development at this location would result in further deficiency of playing pitches.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

Unreasonable Residential Sites

- GNLP0228
- GNLP0540

Thorpe St Andrew – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP0442 Racecourse Plantations, Plumstead Road East, Thorpe St Andrew (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	1 Support, 0 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Member of the public	Support	Considered unreasonable as it's a woodland that surround the East side of Norwich		This site was allowed under a planning appeal by independent planning inspector. However, it is not proposed to allocate the site in the local plan.	None

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2170 Langley North (Former Playing Fields/Langley School), Thorpe St Andrew (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Barton Willmore	Object	Site benefits from outline planning approval for residential development, there is no evidence that development at this location would result in further deficiency of playing pitches. See Full representation.		This site is not allocated as it is located within the settlement limit where development is acceptable in principle providing it does not result in any significant adverse impact.	None

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP2171 Langley South (Former Langley School), Thorpe St Andrew (Unreasonable Residential Site)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	1
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 0 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Barton Willmore		Site benefits from outline planning approval for residential development, there is no evidence that development at this location would result in further deficiency of playing pitches. See Full representation.		This site is not allocated as it is located within the settlement limit where development is acceptable in principle providing it does not result in any significant adverse impact. Half the site is designated as Ancient Woodland which would affect the developable area.	None

TROWSE INCLUDING NON-RESI AT BIXLEY AND WHITLINGHAM

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	TROWSE INCLUDING NON-RESI AT BIXLEY AND WHITLINGHAM OVERVIEW
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	7
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 2 Object, 5 Comment

Trowse (including Non-Resi at Bixley and Whitlingham) has 0 preferred sites, 1 carried forward/uplift allocation, 2 reasonable alternative sites and 0 unreasonable sites.

Main issues

Policy TROW1 - Land on White Horse Lane and to the rear of Charolais Close and Devon Way, Trowse (Carried forward Allocation)

- Cornerstone Planning Ltd - Given that Norfolk Homes' current application would increase the cumulative development of the site to 181 dwellings, request that: policy refers to 'at least 173 dwellings'
- Historic England - Make specific mention of the need to conserve and where opportunities arise enhance the significance of the Trowse Conservation Area.

Site GNLP3051 Land at junction of Loddon Road/Bungay Road, Bixley (Reasonable Alternative Site– Non-Residential – Park and Ride)

- Member of the public - There are discrepancies between TROW2 not being carried forward for allocation of P&R in SNDC SA and suggested RA which may be allocated.
- Member of the public - Proposed Site is adjacent to their property and would object if it went ahead as it would devalue their property.

Site GNLP3052 Land adjacent to Whitlingham Country Park (Reasonable Alternative Site – Non Residential)

- Environment Agency - As a country park would be classed as water compatible development under amenity open space, nature conservation and biodiversity then this would be an acceptable land use within the flood zones, including Flood Zone 3b, Therefore, it would be preferable if any associated built development is located within Flood Zone 1.
- Crown Point Estate - The additional land at WCP should be safeguarded so that it can be called upon to support the additional population arising from new development in the locality. Formally safeguarding the site for leisure and open space purposes through policy will provide confidence in investment within the Park, to support this increasing demand.

Sites not commented on through the consultation:

- None

Trowse (including non-resi at Bixley and Whitlingham) – Carried Forward Allocation

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Policy TROW1 Land on White Horse Lane and to the rear of Charolais Close and Devon Way, Trowse (Carried forward Allocation)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	3
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 2 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Anglian Water	Comment	No reference to water efficiency forming part of design unlike other allocation policies. See also comments on Policy 2.	Consistent policy approach to water efficiency needed.	This matter is dealt with under Policy 2 that applies to all sites. It is not necessary to include it in the allocation policy	None
Cornerstone Planning Ltd	Comment	TROW1-Given that Norfolk Homes' current application would increase the cumulative development of the site to 181 dwellings, we would request that:		Comment noted. Update the policy to reflect the current situation on the site.	Update policy to refer to 181 dwellings.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current planning application is acknowledged in supporting text (Notes); • The policy title refers to "at least 173 dwellings" 			
Historic England	Object	Suggested Change: Make specific mention of the need to conserve and where opportunities arise enhance the significance of the Trowse Conservation Area.		It is accepted that the policy should acknowledge the potential for harm to the heritage assets and the requirement for measure to address this.	Update site policy to read: 'Development will need to conserve and where opportunities arise enhance the significance of the Trowse Conservation Area.....'

Trowse (including non-resi at Bixley and Whitlingham) – Unreasonable Sites

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP3051 Land at junction of Loddon Road/Bungay Road, Bixley (Reasonable Alternative Site– Non-Residential – Park and Ride)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 1 Object, 1 Comment

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Member of the public	Comment	There are discrepancies between TROW2 not being carried forward for allocation of P&R in SNDC SA and suggested RA which may be allocated.	Check status of Park and Ride facilities around Norwich	This proposal was considered as a reasonable alternative in the Regulation 18C consultation to allow for further consideration of the long term plan for the provision of park and ride facilities through	None

				the Transport for Norwich Strategy. There are no plans for a park and ride site in this location therefore deliverability cannot be demonstrated and the site is not allocated.	
Member of the public	Object	Proposed site is adjacent to their property and would object if it went ahead as it would devalue their property.		Comment noted	None

STRATEGY QUESTION: SETTLEMENT/ SITE REFERENCE:	Site GNLP3052 Land adjacent to Whittingham Country Park (Reasonable Alternative Site – Non Residential)
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS:	2
SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT BREAKDOWN:	0 Support, 0 Object, 2 Comments

RESPONDENT (OR GROUP OF RESPONDENTS)	SUPPORT/ OBJECT/ COMMENT	BRIEF SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES REQUIRING INVESTIGATION	DRAFT GNLP RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGE TO PLAN
Environment Agency	Comment	As a country park would be classed as water compatible development under Amenity open space, nature conservation and biodiversity then this would be an acceptable land use within the flood zones, including Flood Zone 3b, Therefore, it would be preferable if any associated built development is located within Flood Zone 1.		This proposal was considered as a reasonable alternative in the Regulation 18C consultation to allow for further consideration regarding the exact nature of the plans. As the majority of the site area is within the Broads Authority it is not considered appropriate for	None

				allocation in this plan. The Broads Authority Plan contains policies relating to Whitlingham Country Park.	
Crown Point Estate	Comment	The additional land at WCP should be safeguarded so that it can be called upon to support the additional population arising from new development in the locality. Formally safeguarding the site for leisure and open space purposes through policy will provide confidence in investment within the Park, to support this increasing demand.		This proposal was considered as a reasonable alternative in the Regulation 18C consultation to allow for further consideration regarding the exact nature of the plans. As the majority of the site area is within the Broads Authority it is not considered appropriate for allocation in this plan. The Broads Authority Plan contains policies relating to Whitlingham Country Park.	None