

## Appendix B - Norwich (Area covered by Norwich City Council)

Unallocated Sites (Residential and Non Residential)with reasons for rejection.

(Sites highlighted in grey were shortlisted through the site assessment process as reasonable alternatives and therefore subject to SA)

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
<b>Norwich</b>				
293-297 Aylsham Road	GNLP0117	1.20	Retail development including supermarket/ food store	The proposed foodstore has been implemented and is open for trading. There is no requirement for allocation of this site.
UEA - University Drive North	GNLP0133A	1.58	Additional Sport Park related development e.g. new sports pitches, car parking and ancillary uses	Development would be likely to have significant impacts on protected green space, green infrastructure and ecological networks.

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
UEA - Land adjoining the Enterprise Centre at Earlham Hall (walled garden and nursery)	GNLP0133-B	1.38	University-related uses, including offices (Use class B1(a)), research and development (Use class B1(b)) and educational uses (Use class D1) providing in the region of 5,000 sqm of floorspace	Boundary error; Revised boundary considered for allocation
UEA – Land between Suffolk Walk and Bluebell Road	GNLP0133-D	2.74	University related development for both academic and non-academic uses.	Boundary error; Revised boundary considered for allocation

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
UEA – Land west of Bluebell Road	GNLP0133F	5.72	University related development e.g. teaching, research, accommodation, general infrastructure and ancillary uses	Development would be likely to have significant impacts on protected green space, green infrastructure and ecological networks.
The Alders, Cooper Lane	GNLP0184	0.71	Residential (unspecified number)	Site proposed for limited housing development appropriate to its location in the Yare Valley and is too small to allocate individually. The site has planning permission for a single dwelling and is below the threshold for allocation.
Henderson Community Park, Ivy Road	GNLP0248 A&B	5.65	Residential and/or light industrial development for an undetermined number of dwellings or employment units	The site comprises open space forming part of an established community park serving residential areas in west Norwich. In the absence of any evidence to justify the loss of the green space there is no basis to release the site for housing. In addition, there is no evidence of need for additional employment allocations.

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
Land east of King Street (King Street Stores & Sports Hall site)	GNLP0377	0.33	Residential development for a minimum of 40-50 dwellings with re provision of existing sports facility/centre	In the absence of evidence that the sports hall is surplus to requirements or any detailed information on how it might be replaced or re-provided allocation of the whole site would be premature and contrary to emerging policy. Existing allocation CC8 on the King Street Stores site only is suitable to carry forward in isolation and any future proposals to develop the sports hall could be progressed through a planning application.
Norwich Airport Park & Ride	GNLP0381	3.40	Redevelopment of site for small scale retail/food store, hotel, business/office use or mixed-use development	There is no requirement for the development proposed and no basis for the release of the Park and Ride site pending decisions on its replacement and the form of the future Park and Ride network in the context of the ongoing Transport for Norwich strategy review. However, once these decisions are clarified the site would be appropriate for release.
Land at Barrack Street/ Whitefriars	GNLP0409	1.57		This site consists of existing allocation CC17b and part of CC17a which is subject to planning consent for residential led mixed-use development. It neighbours the undeveloped residue of allocation CC17a which is consented but has not progressed in recent years. At the time of producing Regulation 18c draft plan progress had not been made on the new development in the west of the site, as such it was considered appropriate to consider the site containing previous allocations CC17a & CC17b as a single site suitable for delivering mixed use development. Progress made since that time has resulted in further

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
				review of the allocation boundaries. Please refer to allocations GNLP0409AR & GNLP0409BR in allocated sites table.
Land at Barrack Street/ Whitefriars	GNLP0409R	3.78	Residential led mixed-use development (minimum <b>300 homes</b> ), offices/managed workspace, ancillary retail, restaurants, bars and recreational open space.	This key regeneration site in the city centre is long term vacant. It was considered appropriate to amalgamate the existing adopted local plan allocations CC17a and CC17b in a single allocation which acknowledges the acceptance in principle of current proposals to develop its western half nearest to Whitefriars for a residential-led scheme. Outline and detailed consents on its eastern half provide for 200 homes and offices to deliver the remaining phases of the St James Place office quarter which is counted in the existing commitment. The allocated site was expected to deliver an uplift of an additional 100 homes. As time has progressed consent has been granted on the western section of the allocation and phase 1 is well under way. It is no longer considered appropriate to allocate this site under a single boundary. Please refer to allocations GNLP0409AR & GNLP0409BR in allocated sites table.
10 Barnard Road	GNLP0453	1.39	Approx. 2,400m <sup>2</sup> of floor space for convenience retail and approx. 1,400m <sup>2</sup> of floorspace for restaurants and cafes	This is an established indoor recreation facility within the Bowthorpe employment area. Proposals for hotel and replacement bowling alley previously refused and dismissed on appeal. No demonstrable need and capacity for the form of development proposed or any justification for the loss of the community recreation facility.

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
Land to east of Spitfire Road and south of Anson Road	GNLP0500	0.64	120-bedroom hotel with associated car parking and landscaping	Hotel proposal already approved and being implemented
Dowding Road	GNLP0523	0.37	Residential development of up to 10 new dwellings	Site too small to meet the minimum allocation requirement and would involve the loss of protected open space
Site of Former Church, Heartsease Lane	GNLP0570	2.44	Residential as an alternative to church redevelopment	Site was previously a private sports club and most recently a (now demolished) place of worship. Site could be appropriate for a carefully designed and integrated housing development although proposals for redevelopment as a church with no residential element have recently been approved and is in active church related uses. Given that housing development is unlikely to be delivered, the site is not considered appropriate for allocation at the current time.
Wensum Lodge, 169 King Street	GNLP1011	0.26	Allocation to protect continued use a community sports facility	<p>This proposal involves no substantive development and protection of individual community facilities is not a matter for the GNLP. Better considered in the context of a review of DM policies.</p> <p>Wensum Sports Hall site is not proposed to be allocated in the absence of evidence to demonstrate that the facility is surplus to requirements or that a mechanism exists to replace or re-provide the sports facility elsewhere.</p>
Imperial Park (formerly Site 4), Norwich Airport	GNLP1061	46.5	General employment floorspace (B1c,	The site falls within the operational area of Norwich Airport. This proposal seeks allocation for general employment use, which is also being pursued through a planning

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
(Partly within Broadland District – Horsham St Faith Parish)			B2, B8 and D1 with ancillary A1-A3 Use Classes).	<p>application. There is no evidence of need for new general employment allocations.</p> <p>The GVA Employment, Retail and Town Centres Study shows no evidence of need for additional general-purpose strategic scale employment allocations given the surplus of existing unimplemented allocated sites, of which there are a number in the vicinity.</p> <p>This site provides a unique opportunity, it is the only site that can provide development for airport related uses; as such it should be secured for such.</p> <p>Alternative version/use of this site has been considered through the assessment process – see allocated sites table.</p>
Chapelfield	GNLP2077	3.66	Additional town centre uses including retail (A1), Leisure (D2) and food and drink (A3)	This proposal does not involve any substantive development but seeks a more flexible approach to the acceptance of uses in the shopping centre. More appropriate to consider in the context of the city centre policy and future review of DM policies.
Congregation Hall, UEA	GNLP2120	0.33	Conference Centre	As a redundant building within the existing designated UEA campus, proposals for a conference centre could be considered through the specific DM policy for the campus or any equivalent successor policy.
Adjoining Sainsbury Centre, UEA	GNLP2123	1.60	University related development possibly	Development would be likely to have significant impacts on protected green space, green infrastructure and ecological networks.

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
			expansion of Sainsbury Centre	
Land at Riverside	GNLP2137	11.68	Mixed use development including residential offices, increased leisure and recreational activities, hotels and retail	A more permissive and flexible policy is being taken forward for the city centre as a whole which should allow for diversification of uses and intensification of development. This site is considered to be a reasonable alternative but in the absence of further evidence on the precise form of development and the quantum of housing which might be deliverable a specific allocation is not considered appropriate at the current time.
Sites at 84- 120 Ber Street, 147-153 Ber Street and Mariners Lane car park	GNLP2159	0.70	Residential development (a minimum of <b>150 homes</b> ). Office or other commercial uses at ground floor level would also be acceptable with scope for educational uses in association with the adjacent Notre Dame High School	147-153 Ber Street is already allocated in the adopted local plan for housing development (CC2). The entire site was previously identified in the 2004 local plan and subject to planning permission for a total of 151 residential units granted in March 2011 but not implemented. The principle of residential development is established. However, the site has been withdrawn from consideration by the landowner during the regulation 18c consultation. The landowner no longer supports development of 84-120 Ber Street during the plan period, but supports re-introduction of existing allocation CC2 147-153 Ber Street to be carried forward. As such GNLP2059 has been withdrawn, please refer to carried forward allocation CC2.



Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for rejection
			being provided on the south-west side of Ber Street.	
Sainsbury Homebase Site, Hall Road Retail Park	GNLP3050	2.28	Residential	Development solely for residential purposes would result in an awkward and inappropriate relationship with neighbouring uses however site is considered to be a reasonable alternative to allow development potential to be assessed in the context of options for the retail park as whole but is not preferred for allocation. Recent proposals and progress on site to retain the retail use and subdivide the unit will mean that the site is now highly unlikely to come forward for alternative forms of development. As such it is not considered deliverable for residential use in the plan period.
Carrow Bridge House	GNLP4056	0.10	11 storey block, 120 flats, restaurants	This site is considered unreasonable as it would involve development on and loss of open space protected under policy DM8 of the adopted local plan, without evidence that the site is surplus to requirements or any other justification. The proposed development would have impacts on landscape character and the setting of designated and undesignated heritage assets (including the historic city wall scheduled monument) with no clear compensatory economic benefit; potentially contrary to existing and emerging policy seeking to protect green infrastructure and open space. The proposed restaurant uses are unrelated to established or proposed centre in the retail hierarchy.