

Greater Norwich Local Plan Hearing Statement

**Matter 11 – Housing and mixed use
allocations - sites currently allocated
in an adopted development plan,
without planning permission**

Introduction

This Hearing Statement has been produced by Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and South Norfolk Council, working with Norfolk County Council as the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP).

The Document Library for the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) Examination and further information can be found on the GNLP Examination website:

www.gnlp.org.uk

The Councils have responded to each question directly in the body of the Hearing Statement.

Site: Land Mountergate/Prince of Wales Road (Mountergate East) (Ref CC4B)
Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

1. Site CC4B was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. CC4B has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 81 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows the 200 unit allocation to be delivered commencing in 2033/34 at a rate of 50 units per year.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

2. CC4B was previously allocated with the land west of Mountergate (CC4A). This site has been split under the GNLP as the parcels of land are in separate ownerships and will be brought forward for development independently. It is expected that the two sites will bring forward a cohesive development of approximate 250 homes in total as referenced in the supporting text to both policies, with 200 of those being accommodated specifically on site for allocation CC4B ([A2](#) pages 78 and 81).
3. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows CC4B commencing delivery 2033/34 with an estimated delivery of 50 units per year. This is supported by information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site ([D2.24](#)), this advises that pre-application advice has already been sought and expresses intention to advance through planning towards the end of 2022 with delivery from 2024, the Trajectory takes a cautious approach to delivery.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

4. The availability of site CC4B is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground agreed with the promoter ([D2.24](#)).

5. The viability of site CC4B has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
6. The deliverability of site CC4B is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
 - Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.24](#)) – please see response to question five where the open space issue raised in the statement of common ground is addressed.
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
 - Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

7. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For CC4B it states that 200 units will be delivered in the period beyond 2026, as confirmed in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.24](#)) provides a more expedient time table, subject to submission of a planning application in 2022.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

8. The policy requirements for CC4B are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the development of the site independently from the adjacent allocation CC4A. This includes a proposed modification to revise the wording of clause 8 of the policy from “*Retention and provision of public access and public open space to the rear of the Hotel Nelson*” to simply “*Provision of public access and public open space*” the reason for this change is to address the fact that the existing area of open space is not currently accessible to the public, therefore this access cannot be ‘retained’ however the policy seeks to protect the requirement for such a provision, this has been agreed with the site promoter through the statement of common ground.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

9. Not applicable to CC4B.

Site: Mile Cross Depot, Norwich (Ref R36) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

10. Site R36 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. R36 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 157-160 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The site has been cleared (under planning consent reference 18/01290/DEM) ready for re-development. The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows the 170 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2024/25.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

11. R36 is forecast to deliver by 2026 which is in accordance with the timescales of the existing allocation. This site was in commercial use which has ceased/been relocated and the site has been cleared in anticipation of achieving planning consent and commencing development. It is expected that the site will bring forward a development of approximate 170 homes in total in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 157-160).
12. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows R36 commencing delivery in 2023/24 with an estimated delivery of 70 units in the first year and the final 100 units the following year. This is supported by information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site ([D2.48](#)). Information received in

response to recent 5 year land supply monitoring suggests that this timetable may be delayed to commencement of delivery in 2024/25 and completion in 2025/26.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

13. The site is in the ownership of Norwich City Council, availability of site R36 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground ([D2.48](#)).
14. The viability of site R36 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
15. The deliverability of site R36 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
 - Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.48](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
 - Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

16. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For R36 it states that 150 units (as per the adopted allocation) will be delivered in the period by 2026. The housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#) forecasts the delivery of the full proposed allocation of 170 units to be completed by 2024/25. Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.48](#)) supports this timetable, subject to submission of a planning application in Summer 2022. Additional information received from Norwich City Council as landowner advises that a design team has been appointed and a budget allocated for the development within the capital programme.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

17. The policy requirements for R36 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP and the shift in focus away from commercial uses to primarily residential.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

18. The proposed uplift in this allocation takes account of the fact that the site is now primarily proposed for residential development with associated community uses, the previously expected small business/commercial uses in this site is surplus to requirements. The densities of the proposed allocation including the uplift are in accordance with strategic policy 2 – sustainable communities, paragraph 4 ([A1](#)) which indicates a minimum net density of 40 dwellings per hectare in Norwich.

Site: Norwich Mail Centre, 13-17 Thorpe Road (Ref CC15) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

19. Site CC15 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. CC15 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 100-102 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows the 150 unit allocation delivery to be completed towards the latter stages of the plan period by 2038.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

20. CC15 is still in ongoing commercial use by Royal Mail as the Norwich Mail Centre. The intention to relocate this use away from this site still exists, however this has not progressed in the timescales initially expected by Royal Mail. As the commercial operation is ongoing, the site owners have not progressed a planning application to date, or sought pre-application advice. It is expected that this shall be progressed once wider commercial decisions have been addressed. The site will bring forward a development of approximate 150 homes in total in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 100-102).
21. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows CC15 delivering towards the later years of the plan by 2038. This is supported by information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site ([D2.30](#)).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

22. The site is in the ownership of Royal Mail Group, availability of site CC15 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground ([D2.30](#)).
23. The viability of site CC15 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
24. The deliverability of site CC15 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.30](#)), this confirms the position in terms of definitions used in the NPPF that the site is developable within the plan period, but not deliverable within the first five years of the plan.
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
 - Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

25. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For CC15 it states that 150 units (as per the adopted allocation) will be delivered in the later years of the plan by 2038. This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.30](#)) supports this timetable, subject to submission of a planning application following relocation of the existing commercial operation.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

26. The policy requirements for CC15 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

27. Not applicable for CC15.

Site: Land at Garden Street and Rouen Road, Norwich (Ref CC10) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

28. Site CC10 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. CC10 has

yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 100-102 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts the 100 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2028/29.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

29. This site is in active use as a surface car park and also contains some units in ongoing commercial use. The submitted statement of common ground advises options are being explored and estimates a preferred option for development to be progressed in 2022. It is expected that the site will bring forward a development of approximate 100 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 91-93).
30. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows CC10 commencing delivery 2028/29 with an estimated delivery of 50 units per year, completing in 2029/30. The information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site does not predict the development coming forward earlier than this ([D2.27](#)).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

31. The site is in the ownership of Norwich City Council, availability of site CC10 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground ([D2.27](#)) though requires negotiated termination of commercial leases to progress.
32. The viability of site CC10 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
33. The deliverability of site CC10 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
 - Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.27](#)), this provides confirmation that the site is developable within the plan period.
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
 - Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory?
(Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

34. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For CC10 it forecasts that 100 units (as per the adopted allocation) will be delivered beyond the first five years of the plan. This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.27](#)) provides evidence that work is underway to progress preferred options for this site in 2022, to be followed by submission of a planning application following relocation of existing commercial operations. The Housing trajectory forecasts the site coming forward in 2028/29, this would be subject to addressing existing lease issues on the site and submission of a formal planning application.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

35. The policy requirements for CC10 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

36. Not applicable for CC10.

Site: Former Eastern Electricity Headquarters, (Duke’s Wharf) Duke Street (Ref GNLP0401) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

37. Site GNLP0401 was allocated as site reference CC21 in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. This site has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP. The site previously had approval for conversion to 69 homes under prior approval (14/01104/PDD – followed by 15/00916/F full consent) with an additional 29 dwellings approved under a full planning application (14/01103/F) which subsequently expired. Through existing allocation and previous consent the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the site has been re-allocated albeit under a new GNLP reference (see page 38-41 of [A2](#) for the GNLP site allocation policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts the 100 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2031/32.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn’t come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

38. This site has benefitted from previous consents for redevelopment. It is a sustainably located brownfield site which has been vacant regarding its former commercial use for a number of years, the site has been in active use as a car park under temporary consents, however the recent planning application reference 19/00838/F for continuation of the temporary use was refused. The submitted statement of common ground advises that the site is under new ownership and pre-application discussions commenced with Norwich City council in August 2021. It is expected that the site will be bring forward a development of at least 100 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 38-41), the statement of common ground ([D2.11](#)) advises that higher density student accommodation, co-living and residential units are being explored as an option through pre-app, though this is yet to be confirmed.
39. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows GNLP0401 commencing delivery 2029/30 with estimated completion in 2031/32. The information in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.11](#)) submitted by the site promoter works to a more expedient timetable, this is subject to submission of a planning application.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

40. The availability of site GNLP0401 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground agreed with the site promoter ([D2.11](#)).
41. The viability of site GNLP0401 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
42. The deliverability of site GNLP0401 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
 - Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.11](#)), this provides confirmation that the site is deliverable within the early years of the plan.
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

43. The Housing Trajectory forecasts the delivery of sites in the GNLP. For GNLP0401 it forecasts that 100 units (as per the proposed allocation) will be delivered beyond the first five years of the plan to be completed in 2031/32. This is a more cautious approach than the information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.11](#)) which forecasts completion on site by 2023. The cautious approach in the trajectory is considered justified at present awaiting submission of a formal planning application for the development.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

44. The policy requirements for site GNLP0401 are justified and effective having been developed through the site assessment and sustainability appraisal process, in liaison with partners such as Norfolk County Council highways, the Lead Local Flood Authority, Minerals and Waste and District and City Council planning colleagues. The policy requirements have been amended where appropriate in response to consultation comments (see Statement of Consultation [A8.1](#) and associated appendices). In the case of site GNLP0401 this included heritage context in

response to concerns from Historic England and reference to water infrastructure in response to Anglian Water.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

45. The proposed uplift in capacity is considered justified as the site has recently expired consents for development of this number of dwellings on the site; the site promoters are also seeking options of higher densities through the planning pre-application process.

Site: Land at Ketts Hill and east of Bishop Bridge Road (Ref R14/R15) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

46. Sites R14/R15 were allocated as two sites in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. R14/R15 have yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and do not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 130-133 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts the 80 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2028/29.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

47. The northern part of this site is in active use as a car sales company and has been subject to unsuccessful planning application for supermarket use. The southern element of this site previously contained a redundant gasholder. Prior approval for its demolition was granted in February 2018, and it has been dismantled & infill works are being prepared. The submitted statement of common ground ([D2.39](#)) advises that there is a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five

years. It is expected that the site will be bring forward a development of approximate 80 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 130-133).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

48. The availability of site R14/R15 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground agreed with the site promoter ([D2.39](#)).
49. The viability of site R14/R15 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
50. The deliverability of site R14/R15 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
 - Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.39](#)) relating to the southern element of the site in the ownership of National Grid. The northern element of the site is in separate ownership.
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
 - Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

51. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For R14/15 it forecasts that 26 units will be delivered by 2026 in accordance with the timescales of the existing allocation, however the remaining 54 units are forecast to deliver beyond 2026. This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.39](#)) provides evidence that work is underway to prepare the site for development by removing the redundant gas holder and repairing the ground in advance of submission of a planning application.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

52. The policy requirements for R14/15 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

53. Not applicable for R14/15.

Site: Heigham Water Treatment Works, Waterworks Road, Norwich (Ref R31) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

54. Site R31 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. R31 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 151-153 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows the 60 unit allocation delivery to be completed towards the mid/latter stages of the plan period by 2033.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

55. R31 is still in ongoing operational use by Anglian Water as the Heigham Water Treatment Works. This part of the of the water treatment works is identified as surplus to Anglian Water's operational needs and is planned to be decommissioned, however this has not progressed in the timescales initially expected by Anglian Water. As the commercial operation is ongoing, the site owners have not progressed a planning application to date or sought pre-application advice. It is expected that the site shall become available after 2025-2030. The proposed site allocation is on a reduced boundary to the existing adopted site, it will bring forward a development of approximately 60 homes in total in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 151-153).
56. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows R31 delivering in 2031/32 2032/33. This is supported by information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site ([D2.46](#)).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

57. The site is in the ownership of Anglian Water, availability of site R31 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground ([D2.46](#)).
58. The viability of site R31 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
59. The deliverability of site R31 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.46](#)), this confirms the position in terms of definitions used in the NPPF that the site is developable within the plan period, but deliverable within the first five years of the plan.
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
 - Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

60. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For R31 it forecasts that 60 units will be delivered beyond the adopted plan period to 2026, but should be delivered by 2033. This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.46](#)) provides evidence that the site is considered available for development within the plan period.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

61. The policy requirements for R31 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

62. Not applicable for R31. The site area has been reduced from the existing adopted allocation to reflect the change in operational circumstances for Anglian Water.

Site: Land at Rose Lane/Mountergate (Mountergate West) (Ref CC4a) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

63. Site CC4A was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. CC4A has yet to be fully developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning

permission for the remaining area, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 78-80 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows the 50 unit allocation to be delivered in the latter stages of the plan by 2038.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

64. CC4A was previously allocated with the land east of Mountergate (CC4B). This site has been split under the GNLP as the parcels of land are in separate ownerships and will be brought forward for development independently. It is expected that the two sites will bring forward a cohesive development of approximate 250 homes in total as referenced in the supporting text to both policies, with 50 of those being accommodated as part of an employment-led mixed-use scheme specifically on site for allocation CC4A ([A2](#) pages 78 - 80).
65. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows CC4A delivering towards the latter stage of the plan period by 2038. This is supported by information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site ([D2.23](#)), this advises that due to multiple land ownerships on the site (including Norwich City Council) land assembly has been difficult. A temporary consent for an entertainment and leisure venue was approved in December 2021 (temporary for a period of one year from opening).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

66. The availability of site CC4A is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground agreed with the promoter ([D2.23](#)).
67. The viability of site CC4A has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
68. The deliverability of site CC4A is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.23](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))

- Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

69. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For CC4A it states that 50 units will be delivered in the period beyond 2026 in the latter stages of the plan period by 2038, as confirmed in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.23](#)) does not forecast earlier delivery.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

70. The policy requirements for CC4A are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the development of the site independently from the adjacent allocation CC4B.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

71. Not applicable for CC4A.

Site: John Youngs Limited, 24 City Road, Norwich (Ref R7) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

72. Site R7 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. R7 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 124-126 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts the 45 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2026/27.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

73. R7 remains in ongoing commercial use by companies within the Carter Group. Part of the site is now vacant, the intention to relocate the remaining uses away from this site still exists, however this has not progressed in the timescales initially expected by the site owner. As the commercial operation is ongoing, the site owners have not progressed a planning application to date, or sought pre-application advice. It is expected that this shall be progressed once wider commercial decisions have been addressed. The site will be bring forward a development of approximately 45 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 124-126).

74. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows R7 delivering towards the later years of the plan by 2038. This is supported by information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site ([D2.30](#)).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

75. The site is entirely in the ownership of R.G Carter Limited, availability of site R7 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground ([D2.37](#)).

76. The viability of site R7 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
77. The deliverability of site R7 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.37](#)), forecasts delivery within the first five years of the plan.
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
 - Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

78. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For R7 it states that 45 units (as per the adopted allocation) will be delivered in 2026/27. This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.37](#)) proposes a more expedient timetable subject to submission of a planning application following relocation of the existing commercial operation. Due to these factors the Housing Trajectory has taken a more cautious approach.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

79. The policy requirements for R7 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

80. Not applicable for R7.

Site: Westwick Street Car Park, Norwich (Ref CC30) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

81. Site CC30 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. CC30 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 114-117 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts the 30 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2030/31.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

82. This site is in active use as a surface car park. The site is in the ownership of Norwich City Council, the submitted statement of common ground ([D2.34](#)) advises options are yet to be explored, this action is yet to be progressed. It is expected that the site will bring forward a development of approximate 30 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 114-117).
83. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows CC30 delivering in 2030/31. The information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site does not predict the development coming forward earlier than this ([D2.34](#)).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

84. The site is in the ownership of Norwich City Council, availability of site CC30 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground ([D2.34](#)).
85. The viability of site CC30 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
86. The deliverability of site CC30 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
 - Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.34](#)), this provides confirmation that the site is developable within the plan period.
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
 - Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

87. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For CC30 it forecasts that 30 units (as per the adopted allocation) will be delivered beyond the first five years of the plan. This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.34](#)) provides information that work is yet to commence regarding preferred options for this site. This site has not been progressed to date as it is adjacent to the allocated site CC22 -Barn Road, which was also owned by Norwich City Council. As both sites are surface car parks, it was considered necessary to continue operation of the Westwick Street site whilst Barn Road was under construction. Barn Road has recently been completed with reprovision of a surface car park beneath the student accommodation development. CC30 - Westwick Street is also in current use as a Covid 19 Testing centre through the pandemic.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

88. The policy requirements for CC30 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

89. Not applicable for CC30.

Site: Two sites at Hurricane Way, Airport Industrial Estate, Norwich (R29) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

90. Site R29 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. R29 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 146-148 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts the 30 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2025/26. It should be noted that this site is within the land that has now been approved for disposal as part the wider Airport industrial estate. This will take it out of public ownership.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

91. This site is currently vacant employment land. The site is in the ownership of Norwich City Council and Norfolk County Council, the submitted statement of common ground ([D2.44](#)) advises options are yet to be explored, this action is yet to be progressed. It is expected that the site will bring forward a development of approximate 30 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 114-117).
92. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows R29 delivering in 2025/26, this is consistent with the forecast delivery in the published AMR. The information in the Statement of Common Ground advises that work is being undertaken on an options appraisal for the whole (wider) airport industrial estate ([D2.44](#)).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

93. The site is in the ownership of Norwich City Council and Norfolk County Council, availability of site R29 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground ([D2.44](#)), although the site is to be marketed for sale.
94. The viability of site R29 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
95. The deliverability of site R29 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.44](#)).
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
 - Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

96. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For R29 it forecasts that 30 units (as per the adopted allocation) will be delivered within the first

five years of the plan. This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.44](#)) provides information that work is yet to commence regarding preferred options for this site. This site has not been progressed to date due to options appraisal on the wider industrial estate. Site R29 is being prepared to be marketed for sale.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

97. The policy requirements for R29 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

98. Not applicable for R29.

Site: Land at 140-154 Oak Street and 70-72 Sussex Street, Norwich (Ref CC18 [CC19]) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

99. Site CC18[CC19] was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. CC18[CC19] has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP. The site area falling under existing allocation reference CC19 has an extant consent. The owners of this site have subsequently purchased adjoining land within the boundary of existing allocation CC18 with the intention of a revised proposal on the larger area

which does not have planning permission. The principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 107-109 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts the 27 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2029/30.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

100. This site is currently vacant employment land. The site is in one ownership, the submitted statement of common ground ([D2.32](#)). advises that options are being explored through work with appointed architects, and following pre-application advice in 2020. Submission of a formal planning application is forecast for Spring 2022. It is expected that the site will bring forward a development of approximately 27 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 107-109).
101. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows CC18 [CC19] delivering in 2029/30. The information submitted by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site ([D2.32](#)) forecasts a more expedient delivery timetable for delivery.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

102. The availability of site CC18 [CC19] is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground agreed with the site promoter ([D2.32](#)).
103. The viability of site CC18 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
104. The deliverability of site CC18[CC19] is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.32](#)).
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
 - Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

105. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For CC18[CC19] it forecasts that 27 units (as per the proposed allocation) will be delivered beyond the first five years of the plan. This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.32](#)) provides information that work is progressing towards a formal planning application with a view to delivering within the first five years of the plan, however in the absence of a formal planning application and slow progress relating to the previous consent, the Housing Trajectory forecasts a more cautious estimate.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

106. The policy requirements for CC18[CC19] are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

107. Not applicable for CC18 [CC19].

Site: Site of former Van Dal Shoes, Dibden Road, Norwich (Ref R17) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

108. Site R17 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. R17 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 134-136 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts the 25 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2025/26.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

109. This site is currently vacant employment land. The site is in one ownership, the submitted statement of common ground ([D2.40](#)) advises that the owner is committed to seeing the site redeveloped. It is expected that the site will bring forward a development of approximately 25 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 134-136).

110. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows R17 delivering in 2025/26. . The information submitted by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site ([D2.40](#)) forecasts a more expedient delivery timetable for delivery, in the absence of a formal planning application, the Housing Trajectory takes a more cautious approach to forecasting.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

111. The availability of site R17 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground agreed with the site promoter ([D2.40](#)).

112. The viability of site R17 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).

113. The deliverability of site R17 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:

- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
- Statement of Common Ground ([D2.40](#)).
- Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
- Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

114. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For R17 it forecasts that 60 units will be delivered beyond the first five years of the plan, this is a typographical error and should refer to 25 units (as per the proposed allocation). This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#).

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

115. The policy requirements for R17 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

116. Not applicable for R17.

Site: 147 – 153 Ber Street, Norwich (Ref CC2) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

117. This site has been withdrawn by the site promoter.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

118. This site has been withdrawn by the site promoter.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

119. This site has been withdrawn by the site promoter.

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

120. This site has been withdrawn by the site promoter.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

121. This site has been withdrawn by the site promoter.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

122. This site has been withdrawn by the site promoter.

Site: Land to rear of City Hall, Norwich (Ref CC24) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

123. Site CC24 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. CC24 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 110-113 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts the 20 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2029/30.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

124. This site is a landscaped area facing St. Giles Street which was originally intended to be an additional wing to City Hall which was never constructed. The submitted statement of common ground ([D2.33](#)) advises that the land is to be assessed under strategic asset management framework and options to be considered. It is expected that the site will bring forward a development of approximate 20 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 110-113).

125. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows CC24 delivering 2029/30. The information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site does not predict the development coming forward earlier than this ([D2.27](#)).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

126. The site is in the ownership of Norwich City Council, availability of site CC24 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground ([D2.33](#)).

127. The viability of site CC24 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).

128. The deliverability of site CC24 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:

- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
- Statement of Common Ground ([D2.33](#)), this provides confirmation that the site is suitable for mixed use development including residential.
- Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
- Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

129. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For CC24 it forecasts that 20 units (as per the adopted allocation) will be delivered beyond the first five years of the plan. This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.33](#)) advises that work is required to explore development options for this site, to be followed by submission of a planning application.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

130. The policy requirements for CC24 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

131. Not applicable for CC24.

Site: Hobrough Lane, King Street, Norwich (Ref CC7) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

132. Site CC7 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. CC7 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 83-86 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts the 20 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2028/29.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

133. This site is long-term vacant and contains a listed building on the 'at risk' register. The submitted statement of common ground ([D2.25](#)) advises that pre-application discussions have been held with the LPA and that more are planned. Development of the site could commence in 2022. It is expected that the site will bring forward a development of approximate 20 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 83-86).

134. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows CC7 delivering in 2028/29. Whilst the information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site forecasts an earlier delivery, in the absence of a formal planning application, the trajectory takes a more cautious approach to delivery ([D2.25](#)).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

135. The availability of site CC7 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground agreed with the promoter ([D2.25](#)).
136. The viability of site CC7 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
137. The deliverability of site CC7 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.25](#)), this forecasts that the site is deliverable within the first five years of the plan period.
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
 - Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

138. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For CC7 it forecasts that 20 units will be delivered beyond the first five years of the plan. This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.25](#)) provides a more expedient timetable for delivery. As this site is not in the current 5YLS and does not have a current planning application or consent, it has been cautiously estimated to deliver beyond 2026 in the trajectory, although the SoCG provides an encouraging direction of travel for potential earlier delivery. The trajectory forecasts delivery in 2028/29.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

139. The policy requirements for CC7 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion

with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

140. Not applicable for CC7.

Site: King Street Stores, Norwich (Ref CC8) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

141. Site CC8 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. CC8 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 87-89 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts the 20 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2028/29.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

142. This site is vacant as there is no longer operation business on the premises. A planning application for 20 dwellings was refused consent by Norwich City Council Planning Committee in November 2021. It is understood that the site promoter is considering appealing this decision, they have until 30 May 2022 to submit the appeal. It is expected that the site will be bring forward a development of approximate 20 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 83-86) whether through appeal or a revised planning application.

143. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows CC8 delivering in 2028/29. Whilst the information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site forecasts an earlier delivery, in the absence of a current consent, the trajectory takes a more cautious approach to delivery ([D2.26](#)).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

144. The availability of site CC8 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground agreed with the promoter ([D2.26](#)).

145. The viability of site CC8 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).

146. The deliverability of site CC8 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:

- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
- Statement of Common Ground ([D2.26](#)), this forecasts that the site is developable within the first five years of the plan period.
- Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
- Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

147. The position detailed above was at the time awaiting decision for the planning application, delivery dates may require update in response to the site promoters decision relating to how to proceed with the site.

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

148. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For CC8 it forecasts that 20 units will be delivered beyond the first five years of the plan. This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.26](#)) provides a more expedient timetable for delivery. As this site does not have a current planning application or consent, it has been cautiously estimated to deliver beyond 2026 in the trajectory in 2028/29.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

149. The policy requirements for CC8 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

150. Not applicable for CC8.

Site: Site of former Gas Holder at Gas Hill, Norwich (Ref R13) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

151. Sites R13 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. R13 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 127-129 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts the 15 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2025/26.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

152. This site previously contained a redundant gasholder, prior approval for its demolition was granted in February 2018, it has been dismantled & infill works are being prepared. The submitted statement of common ground ([D2.38](#)) advises that there is a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. It is expected that the site will bring forward a development of approximate 15 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 127-129).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

153. The availability of site R13 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground agreed with the site promoter([D2.38](#)).

154. The viability of site R13 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).

155. The deliverability of site R13 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:

- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
- Statement of Common Ground ([D2.38](#))
- Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
- Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

156. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For R13 it forecasts that 15 units will be delivered in 2025/26 in accordance with the timescales of the existing allocation. This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.38](#)) provides evidence that work is underway to prepare the site for development by removing the redundant gas holder and repairing the ground in advance of submission of a planning application. The statement of common ground

from the site promoter forecasts potential earlier delivery of the site, however in the absence of a planning consent the trajectory takes a more cautious approach.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

157. The policy requirements for R13 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

158. Not applicable for R13.

Site: Ipswich Road Community Hub, 120 Ipswich Road, Norwich (R2) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

159. Site R2 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. R2 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 121-123 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts the 15 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2026/27.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

160. This site is in the ownership of Norfolk County Council and currently NCC Adult Services operate their service through Independence Matters from the site, this would require relocation prior to development of the site. The submitted statement of common ground ([D2.36](#)) advises that survey work to support a planning application is planned to take place in advance of the cessation of the NCC Adult Services use, to help inform pre-application engagement with City Council Planning Officers, in advance of a full application submission by Repton Property Developments Ltd. It is expected that the site will bring forward a development of approximate 15 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 121-123).
161. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows R2 delivering in 2026/27. The Statement of Common Ground supports this forecasted delivery, but with an increased density ([D2.36](#)).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

162. The availability of site R2 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground agreed with the promoter ([D2.36](#)).
163. The viability of site R2 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
164. The deliverability of site R2 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.36](#)), this forecasts that the site is deliverable following relocation of existing on site use.
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
 - Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

165. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For R2 it forecasts that 15 units will be delivered in 2026/27 just beyond with the timescales of the existing adopted allocation. This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). This is supported by information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.36](#)).

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

166. The policy requirements for R2 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

167. Not applicable for R2.

Site: Land at Argyle Street, Norwich (Ref CC11) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

168. Site CC11 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. CC11 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning

permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 94-96 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts delivery of 14 units on the allocation site to be delivered in 2022/23.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

169. This site is in the ownership of Norwich City Council. The submitted statement of common ground ([D2.28](#)) advises a design team has been appointed and pre-application advice has been received. Work is progressing towards submission of a planning application. It is expected that the site will be bring forward a development of approximate 15 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 94-96).
170. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts delivery on CC11 in 2023/24. The information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site supports this forecast ([D2.28](#)). Additional information provided by Norwich City Council as landowner advises that submission of a planning application for 14 dwellings is imminent.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

171. The site is in the ownership of Norwich City Council, availability of site CC11 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground ([D2.28](#)).
172. The viability of site CC11 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
173. The deliverability of site CC11 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.28](#)), this provides confirmation that the site is deliverable in the first five years of the plan.
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
 - Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

174. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For CC11 it forecasts that 14 units will be delivered within the first five years of the plan (this is two more than the adopted allocation, yet one fewer than the proposed allocation). This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.22](#)) supports this forecast work is progressing towards submission of a planning application.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

175. The policy requirements for CC11 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

176. The proposed uplift for the site is justified on the basis of appraisal work carried out by the site owner and pre-application discussions.

Site: Site of former Earl of Leicester Public House, 238 Dereham Road, Norwich (Ref R33) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

177. Site R33 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 which has an end date of 2026. R33 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. The site previously benefitted from a planning consent, however this lapsed prior to commencement. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 154-156 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts delivery of 12 units on the allocation site to be delivered in the latter years of the plan by 2038.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

178. This site is in single ownership. The site owner has not signed a statement of common ground. However, pre-application advice has been received for this site in January 2022. This indicates that work is progressing towards submission of a planning application. It is expected that the site will be bring forward a development of approximate 12 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 154-156).

179. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts delivery on R33 by 2038. The recent pre-application activity on this site is encouraging that timescales may be improved.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

180. The site is not in multiple ownership which means that bringing it forward for development is not complicated.
181. The viability of site R33 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
182. The deliverability of site R33 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

183. Site R33 is a sustainable located urban brownfield site with limited constraints. It has been cleared and is ready for development.
184. The site benefits from an existing allocation and a previous (now expired) consent for residential use
185. The site has had recent pre-application engagement with Norwich City Council.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

186. The policy requirements for R33 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

187. Not applicable for R33.

Site: 10 – 14 Ber Street, Norwich (Ref CC3) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

188. Site CC3 was allocated in the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)) which has an end date of 2026. CC3 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 75-77 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) forecasts the 10 unit allocation delivery to be completed in 2023/24. Additional information supplied by Norwich City Council as landowner advises that a planning application is due to be submitted in February 2022 for 9 dwellings. This will be a residential only scheme.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

189. This site is in the ownership of Norwich City Council. The submitted statement of common ground ([D2.33](#)) advises a design team has been appointed by the Council's wholly owned company, Norwich Regeneration Ltd (NRL) to take forward to a planning application in 2021/22. It is expected that the site will bring forward a development of approximate 10 homes in accordance with the GNLP site allocation policy ([A2](#) pages 75-77).

190. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows CC3 delivering 2023/24. The information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site supports this forecast ([D2.22](#)).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

191. The site is in the ownership of Norwich City Council, availability of site CC3 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground ([D2.33](#)).

192. The viability of site CC3 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).

193. The deliverability of site CC3 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:

- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
- Statement of Common Ground ([D2.22](#)), this provides confirmation that the site is deliverable in the first five years of the plan.
- Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
- Spreadsheet supporting the response to the Inspectors Initial Question 15 relating to carried forward allocations ([D1.3A](#))

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

194. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For CC3 it forecasts that 10 units (as per the adopted allocation) will be delivered within the first five years of the plan. This is consistent with the forecast in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.22](#)) supports this forecast work is progressing towards submission of a planning application.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

195. The policy requirements for CC3 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with city council colleagues and consultation. Additional policy requirements have been added to reflect the updated policy requirements of the GNLP.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

196. Not applicable for CC3.

Site: Land at Lower Clarence Road (CC13) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

197. This site has been withdrawn by the site promoter.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

198. This site has been withdrawn by the site promoter.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

199. This site has been withdrawn by the site promoter.

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

200. This site has been withdrawn by the site promoter.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

201. This site has been withdrawn by the site promoter.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

202. This site has been withdrawn by the site promoter.

Site: Land at Hospital Grounds, southwest of Drayton Road, Hellesdon (Ref HEL1) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

203. Site HEL1 was allocated in the 2016 Broadland Local Plan ([C1.2](#)) which has an end date of 2026. HEL1 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 216 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows approx. 54 dwelling per annum starting 2032/33 to be delivered by 2037/38.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

204. Bidwells acting on behalf of the Norfolk & Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust states that the Trust are supportive of the redevelopment of the site. The Trust commenced pre-application discussions with Broadland District Council in 2019. These discussions, which have involved lengthy discussions in respect of highways, continued through

2020. The agents have stated that Outline Planning Permission could be secured on the site in 2022, before the site is sold to a developer.

205. It is expected that development could potentially start on the site in 2032. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows a cautious delivery rate of 54 units per annum approx. commencing 2032 with 30 units in the final year, the site could be complete by 2037/38.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

206. The availability of site HEL1 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground / Delivery Statement agreed with the promoter ([D2.67](#))

207. The viability of site HEL1 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).

208. The deliverability of site HEL1 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:

- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
- Statement of Common Ground ([D2.67](#))
- Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))

209. As stated on page 27 of Appendix 4 to Topic Paper 1 ([D3.2](#)) the deliverability of sites has been considered with regard to evidence from the councils' 2019/20 5 Year Housing Land Supply Statement, an updated trajectory produced in November 2021 which took account of agreed evidence from a planning appeal ([D3.2C](#), see page 2 of [D3.2B](#) on the updates), Statements of Common Ground agreed with landowners and developers and other objective evidence including the Lichfields publication '[Start to Finish](#)'.

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

210. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For HEL1 it states that pre-app advice has been carried out, it is hoped an outline application could be secured in 2022 before the site is sold to a developer. There is the potential for a start on site 2023. With a delivery rate of 50 per year, the site could be complete by 2029. The trajectory takes a more cautious approach, anticipating build out by 2037/38, as confirmed in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). This is supported by

information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.67](#))

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

211. The policy requirements for HEL1 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the 2016 Broadland Local Plan allocation ([C1.2](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with district colleagues and consultation. (see Hellesdon Site assessment booklet ([B1.8](#)) and Statement of Consultation [A8.1](#) and [A8.20](#) and associated appendices). An additional policy requirement has been added to reflect the historic environment in response to comments made by Historic England through Statement of Common Ground ([B4.3](#) page 57).

212. The Sustainability Appraisal (see [A6.3 B1.53](#) , for detailed assessments of the site, particularly F283-286, G7) also identified possible mitigation measures in relation to water protection where is included in the policy.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

213. Not applicable for site HEL1.

Site: Land at Spirketts Lane, Harleston (Ref HAR 4). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

214. Site HAR 4 was allocated in the 2015 South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations Plan ([C1.7](#)) which has an end date of 2026. HAR 4 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 283 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows 95 homes to be delivered from 2026/27.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

215. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows 95 homes delivering from 2026/27. This is supported by information in the Statement of Common Ground submitted by the agent Durrants ([D2.84](#)).
216. The Statement of Common Ground explains how the majority of the site is owned by a local farming family, with the balance in the ownership of a charity. Charity Commission approval is being sought for selling the land for development, and once received, planning consent will be pursued. But proactive steps are being taken in the meantime, such as preparing surveys and layout designs, as well as pre-application enquiries to the Council and utility providers.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

217. The viability of site HAR4 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#), see typology 8). This is reinforced by the Statement of Common Ground that is provided by the agent Durrants ([D2.84](#)).

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

218. The Statement of Common Ground from the agent suggests development could happen more quickly. Nevertheless, to be cautious the housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) estimates a start on site in 2026/27.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

219. The policy requirements for HAR4 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the 2015 South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations Plan ([C1.7](#)) and

amended as appropriate following discussion with district colleagues and consultation. The difference being to remove the requirement for access via Willow Walk.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

220. Not applicable for HAR4.

Site: Land off Station Hill, Harleston (Ref HAR 5). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

221. Site HAR5 was allocated in the 2015 South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations Plan ([C1.7](#)) which has an end date of 2026. HAR5 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 285 of A2 for the carried forward policy).

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

222. The Statement of Common Ground ([D2.85](#)) explains how a scheme (ref: 2019/2115) for 40 dwellings has a resolution for approval, subject to agreeing a section 106 agreement. This shows the fundamental commitment of the owners and promoters to bring forward a scheme.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

223. The deliverability of HAR5 is shown by the Statement of Common Ground provided by the promotor Bullen Developments Ltd ([D2.85](#)). This explains how a scheme (ref: 2019/2115) for 40 dwellings has a resolution for approval, subject to agreeing a section 106 agreement.

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

224. The Statement of Common Ground from the agent suggests development could happen more quickly. Nevertheless, to be cautious the housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) estimates a start on site in 2026/27.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

225. The policy requirements for HAR5 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations Plan ([C1.7](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with district colleagues and consultation. The differences relate to updates of the Use Classes Order, confirming wastewater infrastructure, and consulting the Historic Environment Service.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

226. Although not applicable for the policy wording of HAR5, the approval of 2019/2115 would provide an uplift of 40 homes on the allocation.

Site: Land off Broomhill Lane, Reepham (Ref REP1) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

227. Site REP1 was allocated in the 2016 Broadland Local Plan ([C1.2](#)) which has an end date of 2026. A planning application was submitted on the site in March 2020 (planning reference: 20200847) for the proposed residential development of 141 dwellings. The application is pending consideration. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 367 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows the 141 unit allocation to be delivered over a 5 year period, with 26 units being delivered annually in 2026/27 and 2027/28, 31 units being delivered annually in 2028/29 and 2029/30 and a final 26 units being delivered in 2030/31

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

228. A planning application has already been submitted for 141 dwellings on the allocated site. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows REP1 delivering 26 units 2026/27 and 2027/28, 31 units in 2028/29 and 2029/30 and 26 units in 2030/31. This is supported by information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site ([D2.112](#)).

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

229. The availability of site REP1 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground agreed with the promoter ([D2.112](#)).

230. The viability of site REP1 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).

231. The deliverability of site REP1 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:

- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
- Statement of Common Ground ([D2.112](#))

- Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))

232. As stated on page 27 of Appendix 4 to Topic Paper 1 ([D3.2](#)) the deliverability of sites has been considered with regard to evidence from the councils' 2019/20 5 Year Housing Land Supply Statement, an updated trajectory produced in November 2021 which took account of agreed evidence from a planning appeal ([D3.2C](#), see page 2 of [D3.2B](#) on the updates), Statements of Common Ground agreed with landowners and developers and other objective evidence including the Lichfields publication '[Start to Finish](#)'.

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

233. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For REP1 it states that 140 units will be delivered in the period beyond 2026, as confirmed in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#), which shows REP1 delivering 141 units. This is supported by information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.112](#)).

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

234. The policy requirements for REP1 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the 2016 Broadland Local Plan allocation ([C1.2](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with district colleagues and consultation. The original allocation allocated approximately 100-120 dwelling, the carried forward allocates approximately 100 homes. This is reflected in an additional policy amendment which states that more homes may be accommodated, subject to an acceptable design and layout, as well as infrastructure constraints.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

235. REP1 is allocated for 100 home. An application has been made on the site for 141 home which equates to an uplift of 41 homes. This is considered to be justified

Site: Land north of Grove Road (Ref HET2) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

236. Site HET2 was allocated in the 2015 as part of the South Norfolk Local Plan ([C1.7](#)) which has an end date of 2026. HET2 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted. Since it is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, the allocation has been carried forward (see page 338 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows the 40 unit extra care housing allocation to be delivered in 2028/29.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

237. HET2 is adjacent to existing allocation HET1 (part of GNLP0177A), which is also an allocation to be carried forward as an uplift of development. HET2 has not yet been developed, as the phase of development of the HET1 allocation required to access the site, has not yet been progressed. It is expected that the two sites will be master planned and developed together to bring forward a cohesive development, as referenced in both policies ([A2](#) pages 335- 337 and page 339). Development on HET1 is well-advanced and it is expectation that the entire scheme is projected to complete in 2030.

238. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows HET2 delivering 40 units in 2028/29.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

239. Whilst no Statement of Common Ground has been submitted for HET2, the site is still considered to be available. HET2 has yet to be developed as the phase of development of the HET1 allocation required to access the site, has not yet been

progressed. It is expected that the two sites will be master planned and developed together to bring forward a cohesive development, as referenced in both policies ([A2](#) pages 335- 337 and page 339).

240. The viability of site HET2 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).

241. The deliverability of site HET2 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:

- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
- Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))

242. As stated on page 27 of Appendix 4 to Topic Paper 1 ([D3.2](#)) the deliverability of sites has been considered with regard to evidence from the councils' 2019/20 5 Year Housing Land Supply Statement, an updated trajectory produced in November 2021 which took account of agreed evidence from a planning appeal ([D3.2C](#), see page 2 of [D3.2B](#) on the updates), Statements of Common Ground agreed with landowners and developers and other objective evidence including the Lichfields publication '[Start to Finish](#)'.

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

243. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For HET2 it states that 40 units will be delivered in the period beyond 2026, as confirmed in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#).

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

244. The policy requirements for HET2 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the 2015 South Norfolk Local Plan allocation ([C1.7](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with district colleagues and consultation.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

245. Not applicable for HET2.

Site: Land at Jordans Scrapyard, Coltishall (Ref COL2) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

246. Site COL2 was allocated in the 2016 Broadland Local Plan ([C1.2](#)) which has an end date of 2026. COL2 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted through the adopted plan. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, so the allocation has been carried forward (see pages 402 and 403 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows 30 units to be delivered in 2025/26.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

247. The Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) ([D2.122](#)) agreed with the site promoter states that the applicant's agents have liaised with the Local Planning authority and Highways but no formal pre-application advice has currently been sought. The agent has also spoken with developers, and the owners are currently investigating topographical, arboricultural and contamination reports.

248. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The SoCG states that a planning application will be progressed in 2022 with development likely to commence in Spring 2023. This has been reflected in the housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) which shows 30 units to be delivered in 2025/26.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

249. The availability of site COL2 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground agreed with the promoter ([D2.122](#)).

250. The viability of site COL2 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).

251. The deliverability of site COL2 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:

- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
- Statement of Common Ground ([D2.122](#))
- Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
- Spreadsheet to accompany Partnership response to Inspectors Initial Questions – Question 15 ([D1.3A](#))

252. As stated on page 27 of Appendix 4 to Topic Paper 1 ([D3.2](#)) the deliverability of sites has been considered with regard to evidence from the councils' 2019/20 5 Year Housing Land Supply Statement, an updated trajectory produced in November 2021 which took account of agreed evidence from a planning appeal ([D3.2C](#), see page 2 of [D3.2B](#) on the updates), Statements of Common Ground agreed with landowners and developers and other objective evidence including the Lichfields publication '[Start to Finish](#)'.

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

253. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For COL2 it states that 30 units will be delivered in the 5 year forecast to 2026, as confirmed in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). This is supported by information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.122](#)) which states that development could commence in the spring of 2023.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

254. The policy requirements for COL2 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the 2016 Broadland Local Plan allocation ([C1.2](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with district colleagues and through consultation. An additional policy requirement has been added to reflect the need to conserve and enhance the significance of the grade II listed limekiln to the north east of the site following representations made by Historic England.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

255. Not applicable for COL2

Site: Land east of Lion Road, Buxton (Ref BUX1) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

256. Site BUX1 was allocated in the 2016 Broadland Local Plan ([C1.2](#)) which has an end date of 2026. BUX1 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted through the adopted plan. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, so the allocation has been carried forward (see pages 384 and 385 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows the 20 unit allocation to be delivered in 2035/36 and 2036/37.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

257. No Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is currently available for this site but the agent is in discussion with the landowner about preparing a statement, which indicates a continued willingness to bring forward the site. There is no evidence to suggest that the site will not be developed before the end of the plan period in 2038 so a cautious approach to delivery has been taken to reflect this with the Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) showing the 20 unit allocation to be towards the end of the plan period in 2035/6 and 2036/37.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

258. No Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is currently available for this site but the agent is in discussion with the landowner about preparing a statement, which indicates a continued willingness to bring forward the site.

259. The viability of site BUX1 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).

260. The deliverability of site BUX1 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:

- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
- Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
- Spreadsheet to accompany Partnership response to Inspectors Initial Questions – Question 15 ([D1.3A](#))

261. As stated on page 27 of Appendix 4 to Topic Paper 1 ([D3.2](#)) the deliverability of sites has been considered with regard to evidence from the councils' 2019/20 5 Year Housing Land Supply Statement, an updated trajectory produced in November 2021 which took account of agreed evidence from a planning appeal ([D3.2C](#), see page 2 of [D3.2B](#) on the updates), Statements of Common Ground agreed with landowners and developers and other objective evidence including the Lichfields publication '[Start to Finish](#)'.

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

262. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For BUX1 it states that 20 units will be delivered in the period beyond 2026, as confirmed in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). Currently the landowner has declined the opportunity to submit an SoCG but there is no evidence to suggest the site will not be developed before the end of the plan period in 2038 and this is reflected in the cautious approach to the delivery of the site towards the end of the plan period.

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

263. The policy requirements for BUX1 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the 2016 Broadland Local Plan allocation ([C1.2](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with district colleagues and consultation.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

264. Not applicable for BUX1.

Site: Land east of Gayford Road, Cawston (Ref CAW2) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Is the allocation on track as expected within the existing development plan?

Response to question 1

265. Site CAW2 was allocated in the 2016 Broadland Local Plan ([C1.2](#)) which has an end date of 2026. CAW2 has yet to be developed at the base date of the GNLP and does not have planning permission, but the principle of development on the site has already been accepted through the adopted plan. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038, so the allocation has been carried forward (see pages 394 and 395 of [A2](#) for the carried forward policy). The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows the 20 unit allocation to be delivered in 2025/26.

Question 2

If the allocation hasn't come forward as previously expected, what is the reason for this? Is there a reasonable prospect that it will be developed in the plan period?

Response to question 2

266. CAW2 is adjacent to new allocation GNLP0293 which is in the same landownership. It is expected that the two sites will be master planned and developed together to bring forward a cohesive development of approximate 60 homes in total as referenced in both policies ([A2](#) pages 390 and 394).
267. It is expected that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows CAW2 delivering 20 units in 2025/26 with the 40 units on GNLP0293 delivering in 2026/27 and 2027/28. This is supported by information in the Statements of Common Ground which have been submitted for both sites ([D2.118](#) and [D2.120](#)). The SoCG's suggest an earlier completion of the development in 2024 but as this was signed by the promoter in October 2020 a more cautious approach has been taken.

Question 3

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Response to question 3

268. The availability of site CAW2 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground agreed with the promoter ([D2.120](#)).
269. The viability of site CAW2 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
270. The deliverability of site CAW2 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.120](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
 - Spreadsheet to accompany Partnership response to Inspectors Initial Questions – Question 15 ([D1.3A](#))
271. As stated on page 27 of Appendix 4 to Topic Paper 1 ([D3.2](#)) the deliverability of sites has been considered with regard to evidence from the councils' 2019/20 5 Year Housing Land Supply Statement, an updated trajectory produced in November 2021 which took account of agreed evidence from a planning appeal ([D3.2C](#), see page 2 of [D3.2B](#) on the updates), Statements of Common Ground agreed with landowners

and developers and other objective evidence including the Lichfields publication [‘Start to Finish’](#).

Question 4

Does the evidence support the delivery of the housing units on the expected trajectory? (Document 3.2C)?

Response to question 4

272. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For CAW2 it states that 20 units will be delivered in the 5 year forecast to 2026, as confirmed in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#). This is supported by information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.120](#)).

Question 5

Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

Response to question 5

273. The policy requirements for CAW2 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the 2016 Broadland Local Plan allocation ([C1.2](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with district colleagues and consultation. An additional policy requirement has been added to reflect the need to masterplan the site with adjacent allocation GNLP0293.

Question 6

Is any proposed uplift in capacity, or extension to the site, justified and supported by the evidence?

Response to question 6

274. Not applicable for CAW2