

Greater Norwich Local Plan Hearing Statement

Matter 12 – Housing and mixed use allocations – sites with extant 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: Three Score, Bowthorpe (Ref R38). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

1. The site benefits from extant planning permission. Outline planning permission was granted on 8 July 2013 for 1000 homes and a care home (12/00703/O). Condition 11 requires the approval of all reserved matters within fifteen years from the date of the permission. Phase I which was for 92 housing with care units and 80 bed dementia care home is fully complete (13/02031/RM). Reserved matters was originally approved for phase 2 for 172 dwellings but the number of units was reduced to 153 by a Minor Material Amendment application (19/00497/MA). This phase is nearing completion. These two phases are not included in the proposed GNLP site allocation and together provide for 245 of the 1,000 homes permitted under the outline consent. This leave 755 homes to be provided on the remainder of the site.
2. A reserved matters application was approved on 21 October 2021 for 76 dwellings and associated works on part of the site that is proposed to be allocated under the GNLP (21/01073/RM). It is anticipated that other reserved matters application will come forward in due course and within the time period required by condition 11 of the outline consent.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

3. The site specific delivery assumptions are justified and the deliverability of site R38 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
 - Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Appendix 5 to Topic Paper 1 ([D3.2](#)) page 64. However this information is now out of date. The up to date information is described at paragraph 6 of this response.
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.50](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
4. The site is in single ownership (owned by Norwich City Council) and is available for development within the plan period.
5. 32 homes were delivered in 20/21 and it is anticipated that 42 will be completed in 21/22 (all of which are on phase 2 so do not form part of this allocation).

6. Phase 3 is to be phased with half of the dwellings (38) being delivered in 2022/23 and half (38) in 2023/24. Further phases will enable the delivery of approx. 100 dwellings per annum from 2024/25 for the remainder of the site.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

7. The policy requirements for R38 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the 2014 Norwich City Council Local Plan allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate to take into account development that has already come forward on the wider site.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

8. Outline permission was granted for 1000 dwellings, a care home, a new village centre, public open space and associated new roads and infrastructure.
9. Policy R38 incorrectly sets out that 900 homes will be provided and the supplementary text incorrectly sets out that 900 homes will be provided and more may be accommodated, subject to an acceptable design and layout being achieved. Given a total of 245 homes will be completed under phase 1 and 2, the allocation of the site for 900 homes would result in an uplift of 145 homes which has never been the intention of the policy (with the landowner having no intention of delivering more homes than that which is permitted by the outline consent). The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) is correct and therefore a modification to the policy is being sought to make the policy wording consistent with the outline consent and the trajectory.
10. No extension to the site area is proposed. The site area is now 25.29 ha compared to 32.2ha for the outline consent. This reduction is due to phase 1 and phase 2 being excluded from the new site area as it is largely completed.

Site: Land at Barrack Street/Whitefriars (GNLP0409AR). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

11. The site benefits from extant planning permission. Planning consent 18/01286/F has been implemented with the first 88 homes being completed in 2020/2021.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

12. The site specific delivery assumptions are justified and the deliverability of site GNLP0409AR is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Appendix 4 to Topic Paper 1 ([D3.2](#)) page 45
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
13. The site is available for development within the plan period.
14. 88 homes were delivered in 20/21 and it is anticipated that 50 will be completed in 21/22, 50 in 22/23 and 32 in 23/24. This is considered achievable. No statement of Common Ground was submitted for this site and it was not considered necessary to pursue one due to development being well advanced.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

15. The policy requirements for GNLP0409AR are justified and effective and whilst development is well advanced it is considered appropriate to allocate the site covered by planning approval 18/01286/F to ensure that the site is built out in its entirety including the un-commenced phases (including the affordable housing contributions).
16. The policy wording takes account of the extant planning permission on the site. The planning application decision was made following extensive consultation and careful consideration of all planning matters. 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 GNLP0409AR this included producing a Heritage Statement ([B10.6](#)) in response to concerns from Historic England.

17. Policy requirements are necessary to make development acceptable on the site and to mitigate any potential harm.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

No uplift in capacity is proposed. No extension to the site is proposed.

Site: Land at Barrack Street/Whitefriars (Ref GNLP0409BR). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

18. The site no longer benefits from extant planning permission for housing development. Outline permission was granted on 12 Aug 2016 for the erection of up to 200 dwellings, together with public open space and up to 127 car parking spaces for B1 office use and 150 residential parking spaces (15/01927/O). A Reserved matters application has not been submitted within the 3 years required by condition 1 of the consent.
19. Part of the site has extant consent for two office buildings (08/00538/RM). This permission has been implemented, although the buildings have not yet been constructed.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

20. The site specific delivery assumptions are justified and the deliverability of site GNLP0409BR is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
 - Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Appendix 4 to Topic Paper 1 ([D3.2](#)) page 46
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))

21. The site is in single ownership and is available for development within the plan period. The site has been promoted, is assessed as suitable, and is appraised as viable.
22. 200 homes are included in the housing trajectory in the later plan period (to be delivered from 2030/31) as a cautious approach. The site is available for redevelopment and the landowner Jarrold and Sons intends to redevelop the land. The site is not included any earlier in the housing trajectory due to ongoing discussions about the exact mix of uses on the site. It is considered that the policy as worded provides for sufficient flexibility for the exact mix to be resolved through the planning application process. It is considered that the delivery of the neighbouring site (GNLP0409AR) will act as catalyst for the redevelopment of this part of the site.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

23. The policy requirements for GNLP0409AR are justified and effective. The policy wording takes account of the expired outline planning permission on this site and the extant permission on the neighbouring site (GNLP0409AR).
24. Both of these planning application decisions were made following extensive consultation and careful consideration of all planning matters and whilst there are two separate allocations for the sites, many of the same issues are applicable. 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 GNLP0409BR this included producing a Heritage Statement ([B10.7](#)) in response to concerns from Historic England.
25. Policy requirements are necessary to make development acceptable on the site and to mitigate any potential harm.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

26. The site is proposed to be allocated for residential-led mixed use development, including a minimum of 200 homes. Therefore no uplift to the previous consent is proposed. An extension to the site area is however included as it is now proposed to incorporate land directly to the north of the river. In 2008 a reserved matters application was approved for office and retail on this parcel of land and although the buildings have not yet been constructed, the permission was implemented and

therefore can be built out. This additional parcel of land was included within the previous site allocation (CC17a). Including this parcel of land will allow for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site and will provide better integration in term of links through the site (including the riverside walk) and will enable more careful consideration of issues such as views, flood mitigation, landscaping and impact upon heritage assets.

Site: Land adjoining Norwich City Football Club north and east of Geoffrey Watling Way (Ref CC16). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

27. Much of the site benefits from extant planning permission. Outline planning permission was granted on 28 June 2013 for residential-led development of between 200 and 250 no. residential flats (Use Class C3) and 140 car parking spaces with commercial office space (Class B1a), groundsman's facilities (Class B8), community uses (Class D1/D2) and associated works including Riverside Walk and access road (11/02104/O). Reserved Matters was subsequently approved on 5 November 2013 to provide 250 No. residential flats (Class C3), 113sqm offices (Class B1a), 279sqm groundsman's facilities (Class B8), and 401sqm of flexible office space (Class B1a) and community uses (Class D1/D2) with 126 No. parking spaces, associated highways works and provision of a Riverside Walk (13/01270/RM). This permission was implemented and development is underway.
28. More recently on the 19 February 2019, full planning permission was granted on the groundsman's hut site for the construction of 73 flats with associated parking, landscaping and highways works (17/01091/F). Development has commenced so the permission has been implemented.
29. The remainder of the site does not benefit from extant planning consent; however it is allocated within the Norwich City Council Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan 2014 ([C1.5](#)).

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

30. The site specific delivery assumptions are justified and the deliverability of site CC16 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:

- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) The site is allocated for 270, this figure is covered by extant consents 13/01270/RM for 250 dwellings (50 of which are outside of the allocation boundary as were already delivered in 2019/20 so only 200 are counted within the allocation) and 17/01091/F for 73 dwellings. Since drafting the policy subsequent units have been delivered on this site. Current information calculates that 154 of the 270 units remain to be delivered on this allocation (101 on consented site 13/01270/RM and 53 on consented site 17/01091/F).
- Statement of Common Ground ([D2.31](#))
- Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))

31. The site has been promoted, is assessed as suitable and has been appraised as viable. The SoCG indicates the landowners intention to continue to bring forward the development. In terms of the site that does not currently benefit from planning permission the SoCG sets out that FW Properties and the NCFC intend to submit a planning application to the City Council at the earliest available opportunity.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

32. The policy requirements for CC16 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Local Plan allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate to take into account issues discussed during the assessment of the planning permission on the sites. The planning application decision was made following extensive consultation and careful consideration of all planning matters.
33. The policy requirements have also been amended where appropriate in response to consultation comments, including the addition of reference to the Bracondale Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings including Carrow Prior and Boom Towers to take into account concerns raised by Historic England (see Statement of Consultation [A8.1](#) and associated appendices). Policy requirements also now take into consideration proposed development at East Norwich Regeneration Area.
34. The policy requirements are necessary to make development acceptable on the site and to mitigate any potential harm.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

35. No uplift in capacity is proposed and no extension to the site is proposed.

Site: St Mary's Works and St Mary's House (Ref GNLP3054). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

36. The site no longer benefits from extant planning permission for housing development. Outline permission was granted on 3 May 2018 for the demolition of office/workshop buildings; part retention, conversion and extension of St Mary's Works building and redevelopment of the site to provide circa 151 residential units; circa 4,365sqm office floor space, circa 3,164sqm hotel and ancillary restaurant facility; circa 451sqm retail; circa 57sqm gallery space; circa 120 parking spaces and associated landscaping works (16/01950/O). Condition 1 required the submission of all reserved matters within three years; these reserved matters applications have not been forthcoming.
37. The site current benefits from planning permission for the temporary change of use of the car park as an outdoor events venue/food market for a 12 months period (21/00373/U). This permission was granted on 19th May 2021.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

38. The site specific delivery assumptions are justified and the deliverability of site GNLP3054 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Appendix 4 to Topic Paper 1 ([D3.2](#)) page 50-51
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.20](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
39. The site has been promoted, is assessed as suitable and has been appraised as viable. The SoCG indicates the landowners intention to bring forward the development. It explains that outline planning permission was previously granted (16/01950/O) and a revised scheme was submitted but eventually withdrawn from consideration. Despite this the landowner remains committed to the site and intends to submit another planning application. The SoCG thus gives confidence that the site is developable within the plan period. To be cautious, the site is being treated as 'developable' under the NPPF definition to allow ample time to progress to a planning consent, and as such is projected in the trajectory to be built out from 2027/28 with 150 homes.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

40. The policy requirements for GNLP3054 are justified and effective. The policy wording takes account of the previous consent on the site. The planning application decision was made following extensive consultation and careful consideration of all planning matters. 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 GNLP3054 this included producing a Heritage Statement ([B10.13](#)) in response to concerns from Historic England.
41. Policy requirements are necessary to make development acceptable on the site and to mitigate any potential harm.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

42. The expired consent is for 151 dwellings with the allocation being for a minimum of 150. Therefore no uplift is proposed and no extension to the site is proposed.

Site: Land at and adjoining St Georges Works, Muspole Street (Ref GNLP2114). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

43. Part of the site benefits from extant consent for residential development, permitted through the prior approvals process. Seymour House (30-34 Muspole Street) has consent for 23 dwellings (15/01512/PDD) and The Guildhall (51 Colegate) has consent for 37 apartments (15/01713/PDD). Whilst the decisions date back to 2015, at this point it was not possible to add a condition requiring development to commence or be completed within a certain period of time, so both permissions whilst not yet implemented are extant.
44. Planning permission was also granted in 2008 for the redevelopment of the depository building and the central part of the proposed site allocation to provide 47

apartments and 10 houses (08/00866/F). An application in 2012 (12/00413/ET) extended the time period for implementation but this has since expired.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

45. The site specific delivery assumptions are justified and the deliverability of site GNLP2114 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Appendix 4 to Topic Paper 1 ([D3.2](#)) page 47-48
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.17](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
46. The site has been promoted, is assessed as suitable and has been appraised as viable. The SoCG indicates the landowners intention to bring forward the development. The SoCG thus gives confidence that the site is developable within the plan period. To be cautious, the site is being treated as 'developable' under the NPPF definition to allow ample time to progress to a planning consent, and as such is projected in the trajectory to be built out from 2026/27 with 55 homes in 26/27 and 55 in 27/28.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

47. The policy requirements for GNLP2114 are justified and effective. The policy wording takes account of ongoing discussions with colleagues and the policy requirements have been amended where appropriate in response to consultation comments, including specific reference to heritage assets to take into account concerns raised by Historic England (see Statement of Consultation [A8.1](#) and associated appendices).
48. The policy requirements are necessary to make development acceptable on the site and to mitigate any potential harm.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

49. The site has extant planning permission for 60 units which results in an uplift of 50 units. Seymour House (30-34 Muspole Street) and The Guildhall (51 Colegate) only form a small part of the site and the previous consent for the remainder of the site demonstrates that at least 50 units can be accommodated.
50. The extended site area will allow for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site.

Site: The Norwich Community Hospital site, Bowthorpe Road (Ref R37). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

51. The site benefits from extant planning permission. Outline planning permission was granted on 24 June 2021 for the redevelopment of the site to provide a new hospital; residential care home; extra care units; key worker units; change of use of Woodlands House to provide residential units; mixed provision of ancillary office space, independent Class E(g)(i) office space, Class E(a) retail space; and associated car parking and landscaping (18/00372/O). This outline consent covers the majority of the proposed allocation. The western part of the allocation does not benefit from planning permission but does form part of the existing R37 allocation.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

52. The site specific delivery assumptions are justified and the deliverability of site R37 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.49](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
53. The site benefits from outline consent and is in single ownership (owned by NCHC HNS Trust). The site is currently an active healthcare site but some of the redundant

buildings have been demolished ready for redevelopment. Some disused buildings remain.

54. 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 R37 commencing delivery 2030/31. The information in the Statement of Common Ground which has been submitted for the site does not set out timescales for delivery and therefore a cautious approach has been taken.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

55. The policy requirements for R37 are justified and effective. The policy wording takes account of issues discussed during the assessment of the outline planning permission.
56. The planning application decision was made following extensive consultation and careful consideration of all planning matters. The policy requirements have been amended where appropriate in response to consultation comments, including the addition of reference to the Earlham Cemetery Register Park and Garden and listed Jewish Mortuary Chapel to take into account concerns raised by Historic England (see Statement of Consultation [A8.1](#) and associated appendices).
57. The policy requirements are necessary to make development acceptable on the site and to mitigate any potential harm.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

58. The proposed allocation is for a minimum of 80 units to be provided through mix of care accommodation, key worker accommodation and residential development. The extant outline application includes the conversion of Woodlands Housing into 12 residential units and potential for 36 no. 4 bedroom key worker cluster units. The scheme also proposes opportunities for a residential care home and extra care units which has the potential to provide for a variety of additional housing needs and will contribute towards housing delivery. Both the proposed policy and existing outline permission allow for some flexibility and whilst housing numbers for the extant permission are not defined the potential is there for at least 80 units (or equivalent) and therefore no uplift is proposed.

59. The proposed allocated site is larger than the site which benefits from outline consent. The parcel of land excluded from the outline permission was previously allocated for residential development as the expectation was that it would be disposed of as part of the future rationalisation and redevelopment of the hospital. Redevelopment plans are still being progressed however this part of the original local plan allocation site is now identified for continued healthcare use. The proposed wording of policy R37 allows for hospital development and ancillary activities and its inclusion as part of the new policy will enable the NHS to plan holistically and meet its operational needs.

Site: Site of former Start Rite Factory, 28 Mousehold Lane (Ref R18). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

60. The site benefits from an extant planning permission. Application 18/01772/F for the erection of a 79 bed residential care home and 42 supported living apartments (class C2) with associated works was granted on 6 June 2019 and the permission has been implemented with the construction of the care home underway. A subsequent material amendment application reference 20/01624/MA reduced the number of beds in the residential care home from 79 to 77.
61. A new planning application (21/01847/F) is currently pending consideration for a retirement living development comprising 45 flats for social rent. This is an alternative to the supported living apartment element of the previous consent.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

62. The site specific delivery assumptions are justified and the deliverability of site R18 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
63. The site is assessed as suitable and has been appraised as viable. Development is underway on the residential care home. No statement of Common Ground was submitted for this site and it was not considered necessary to pursue one as development has commenced.
64. The housing trajectory shows all units being delivered in 22/23.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

65. The policy requirements for R18 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Local Plan allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate to take into account issues that were considered when assessing the extant planning permission on the site. The planning application decision was made following extensive consultation and careful consideration of all planning matters. Policy requirements are necessary to make development acceptable on the site and to mitigate any potential harm.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

66. The allocation does not propose an uplift in capacity or an extension to the site area. The extant planning permission on the site does however demonstrate that at least 40 units could be achieved on the site.

Site: Land adjacent to the River Wensum and the Premier Inn, Duke Street (Ref GNLP0068). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

67. The site benefits from an extant planning permission. Planning permission was granted on 22 November 2019 for the redevelopment of the car park site to provide student accommodation (18/01552/F). Previous to this consent was granted in 2004 for 21 homes. The earlier permission was implemented and remains valid through the construction of the hotel forming part of the same approved proposals.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

68. The site specific delivery assumptions are justified and the deliverability of site GNLP0068 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Appendix 4 to Topic Paper 1 ([D3.2](#)) page 42-43
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.5](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
69. The site is available for development within the plan period. The site has been promoted, is assessed as suitable, and has been appraised as viable.
70. The SoCG sets out that site owners are currently in the process of appointing main contractors to undertake construction of the scheme. The SoCG also states that the intention is to start construction in 2022 and to have the accommodation ready for 2023/24 academic year. Applying a ratio of one home to each 2.85 student bedrooms, GNLP0068 is expected to deliver equivalent to 58 homes.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

71. The policy requirements for GNLP0068 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 and City Council planning colleagues. The policy wording takes account of issues that were considered during the process of assessing the previous planning application on the site. The planning application decision was made following extensive consultation and careful consideration of all planning matters. Policy requirements are necessary to make development acceptable on the site and to mitigate any potential harm.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

72. No uplift in capacity is proposed through the allocation and no extension to the site is proposed. The extant planning permission on the site would demonstrate that at least 25 homes (or 125 student bedrooms) could be delivered on the site.

**Site: Land at Constitution Motors, 140-142 Constitution Hill (Ref GNLP0282).
Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:**

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

73. The site benefits from extant planning permission. Outline planning permission was granted on 14 February 2019 for the erection of up to 12 dwellings and reserved matters was approved on 9 December 2020.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

74. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows 12 homes being delivered in 21/22. Whilst some site clearance has been undertaken, there are complications in terms of contamination and further site investigation is required. This has delayed the delivery of homes so no homes will be delivered in 21/22. Notwithstanding this, the applicant remains committed to delivering development on the site and it is expected the extant permission will be built out and that development will take place within the time period of this local plan up to 2038.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

75. The policy requirements for GNLP3054 are justified and effective. The policy wording takes account of the previous consent on the site. The planning application decision was made following extensive consultation and careful consideration of all planning

matters. Policy requirements are necessary to make development acceptable on the site and to mitigate any potential harm.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

76. No uplift is proposed. No extension to the site is proposed.

Site: Land west of Bluebell Road, and north of Daisy Hill Court/Coral Court, Westfield View (Ref R42). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

77. Part of the site benefits from extant planning permission. Planning permission was granted on 14 January 2021 for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of 32 bungalows, 18 apartments, residents pavilion, access and ancillary development on the southern part of the allocation (19/00911/F). Whilst the northern part of the site does not benefit from planning consent, a masterplan for the whole site has been agreed.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

78. The site specific delivery assumptions are justified and the deliverability of site R42 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:

- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
- Statement of Common Ground ([D2.51](#))
- Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))

79. The site is available for development within the plan period. The site has been promoted, is assessed as suitable, and has been appraised as viable.

80. The SoCG states that the intention is to start construction on phase 2 in 2022. It is anticipated that there will be a 12 month lead in period from start on site to first completions and further to this a 2 year build programme is forecast resulting in phase 2 being build complete in 25/26. The housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) includes 35

homes in 21/22 and 15 homes in 22/23. This is to be updated in the forthcoming 5 year housing land supply so it accords with the more recent information submitted by the applicant.

81. An application has not yet been forthcoming on phase 3; however the SoCG indicates the intention to engage with the Council imminently so the assumption that the remaining homes could be provided in 25/26 and 26/27 is reasonable and justified.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

82. The policy requirements for R42 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Local Plan allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate to take into account issues that were considered when assessing the extant planning permission on the site. The planning application decision was made following extensive consultation and careful consideration of all planning matters. Policy requirements are necessary to make development acceptable on this particularly sensitive site and to mitigate any potential harm.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

83. An uplift of 100 units on the existing adopted site allocation is proposed in terms of capacity. The previous allocation was for approx. 120 homes. Phase 1 delivered 62 retirement apartments and 58 supported care units. As phase 1 has been completed this part of the site is no longer allocated; however previous delivery rates justify this uplift.
84. Consent has already been granted for 50 units on phase 2. It is considered that phase 3 could accommodate a similar number of dwellings, taking into account constraints. The SoCG suggest that a proposal for 88 dwellings, comprising a mix of retirement bungalows and apartments will be proposed. A pre-application has not yet been forthcoming and the Council has not yet expressed a view as to whether as many as 88 dwellings will be acceptable.
85. No extension to the site is proposed. The site area has been reduced to take into account development that has been completed.

Site: Land north of Windmill Road, Norwich (Ref R19). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

86. The site benefits from extant planning permission for residential development. Planning permission was granted on 19 November 2019 for the erection of 17 dwellings (19/00971/F).

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

87. The site specific delivery assumptions are justified and the deliverability of site R19 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
88. The site is available for development within the plan period and the existing consent has been implemented. The site is assessed as suitable, and has been appraised as viable. Whilst no statement of Common Ground has been submitted, delivery of all 17 homes is assumed for 23/24 which is considered achievable.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

89. The policy requirements for R19 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Local Plan allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate to take into account issues that were considered when assessing the extant planning permission on the site. The planning application decision was made following extensive consultation and careful consideration of all planning matters. Policy requirements are necessary to make development acceptable on the site and to mitigate any potential harm.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

90. Whilst the proposed GNLP policy would be an uplift of 7 dwellings from the existing allocation, 17 units has already been considered acceptable through application 19/00971/F and is taken into account in the housing trajectory. Therefore no uplift is proposed by this policy and no extension to the site is proposed.

Site: Land adjoining Sentinel House, (St Catherine's Yard) Surrey Street (Ref GNLP0451). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

91. The site benefits from extant planning permission. Planning permission was granted at appeal on 21 June 2018 for the redevelopment of the site to provide 252 student bedroom development with associated access and landscaping (18/00437/F).

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

92. The site specific delivery assumptions are justified and the deliverability of site GNLP0068 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Appendix 4 to Topic Paper 1 ([D3.2](#)) page 46-47
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.14](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
93. The site is available for development within the plan period. The site has been promoted, is assessed as suitable, and has been appraised as viable.
94. Development has commenced on the site and the accommodation is expected to be available for accommodation by student in the academic year 2023/24. This is one year later than that set out within the housing trajectory which sets out that all units will be delivered in 22/23. As the accommodation is for students a ratio has been applied. This has been calculated at 107 dwellings equivalent (217 en-suite rooms / 6

accessible en-suite rooms counted at 1:2.85 = 78) (25 studios / 4 accessible studios counted at 1:1 = 29) For information relating to how student accommodation is calculated, please refer to document [D3.2B](#) pages 3 – 5.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

95. The policy requirements for GNLP0451 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 and City Council planning colleagues. The policy wording takes account of issues that were considered during the process of assessing the previous planning application on the site. The planning application decision was made following extensive consultation and careful consideration of all planning matters. Policy requirements are necessary to make development acceptable on the site and to mitigate any potential harm.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

96. No uplift in capacity is proposed through the allocation and no extension to the site is proposed. The extant planning permission on the site would demonstrate that at least 40 homes (or 200 student bedrooms) could be delivered on the site.

Site: Land east of Starling Road, Norwich (Ref R20). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

97. The site benefits from extant planning permission for housing development. Outline permission including matters of access, layout and scale was granted on 19 March 2020 for the demolition of derelict workshops and construction of 19 flats with associated works (18/00952/O). Permission was also granted on 5 June 2019 for full planning permission for the construction of 9 no. dwellings with associated drainage and external works (18/00271/F). The two applications are for different parts of the site so in total 28 homes could be provided on the site.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

98. The site specific delivery assumptions are justified and the deliverability of site R20 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
99. The site is available for development within the plan period. The site has been assessed as suitable and has been appraised as viable. Whilst no statement of Common Ground has been submitted, delivery of 19 homes is assumed for 25/26 and 9 homes for 26/27 which is considered achievable.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

100. The policy requirements for R20 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Norwich City Council Local Plan allocation ([C1.5](#)) and amended as appropriate to take into account issues that were considered when assessing the extant planning permissions on the site. The planning application decisions were made following extensive consultation and careful consideration of all planning matters. Policy requirements are necessary to make development acceptable on the site and to mitigate any potential harm.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

101. No uplift in capacity is proposed through the allocation and no extension to the site is proposed. The extant planning permissions on the site would demonstrate that 28 homes could be delivered whilst the allocation is for a minimum of 23 homes.

Site: Land north of the A11, Cringleford (Ref GNLP0307/GNLP0327). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

102. The allocation benefits from planning permissions (see [A2](#), pages 200-201) as the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan identified an area for approximately 1,200 new homes for which permissions are now in place (outline application references 2013/1494 and 2013/1793) for up to 1,300.
103. These permissions do not occupy the whole of the housing site allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The remaining area of land identified in the Neighbourhood Plan as suitable for development is located between the Norwich southern bypass Landscape Protection Zone (set out in the Neighbourhood Plan) and the edge of the permitted schemes. giving potential for further development beyond 2026. The uplift in housing on land allocated for development is estimated as an extra 410 dwellings on top of the 1,300 dwellings already permitted. In addition, both outline permissions make provision for a primary school site, but only that within outline 2013/1793 will be required. The primary school site within outline permission 2013/1793 is approximately 2 hectares, the identified housing uplift is likely to require a larger school site, to be accommodated on land adjoining the already identified site.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

104. The availability of site GNLP0307/GNLP0327 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground / Delivery Statement agreed with the promoter ([D2.63](#)).
105. The viability of site GNLP0307/GNLP0327 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
106. The deliverability of site GNLP0307/GNLP0327 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground/ Delivery Statement ([D2.63](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))

107. As stated on page 51-52,72 of Appendix 4 to Topic Paper Policy 1 Growth Strategy ([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](#)'.
108. For GNLP0307/GNLP0327 in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#) states that 75 units will be delivered per annum in the period beyond 2026, with the exception of the first year (35 units). This is supported by information provided by the site promoter in the Statement of Common Ground ([D2.63](#)) which states that there are no land ownership constraints that would affect or delay the development of the uplift area.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

109. The policy requirements for site GNLP0307/GNLP0327 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 [8.20](#) associated appendices). In the case of site GNLP0307/GNLP0327 the allocation benefits from planning permissions as the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan identified an area for approximately 1,200 new homes for which permissions are now in place.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

110. The proposed uplift in housing on land allocated for development is estimated as an extra 410 dwellings on top of the 1,300 dwellings already permitted. In addition, both outline permissions make provision for a primary school site, but only that within outline 2013/1793 will be required. The primary school site within outline permission 2013/1793 is approximately 2 hectares, the identified housing uplift is likely to require a larger school site, to be accommodated on land adjoining the already identified site.

111. Site GNLP0307 is adjacent to a stream with a significant section of culverted watercourse (1.2km) in total. Opening up this stream again as well as any contribution towards enhancing the natural habitats of the Yare Valley would be supported by the Environment Agency. Highways England has confirmed that it is likely that the proposed improvement of the A47 Thickthorn interchange will be able to accommodate the proposed uplift but this will need to be confirmed with a Transport Assessment. (see [A2](#), pages 200-201)

Site: Land at the Royal Norwich Golf Club, either side of Drayton High Road, Hellesdon (Ref HEL2). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

112. This site was allocated in 2016 as part of the Broadland Local Plan ([C1.2](#)) but has not yet been fully developed. It is expected that the complete development will take place within the time-period of the new local plan up to 2038. The site is re-allocated for residential development and has been considered in the calculation of the housing requirement. This is reflected in the Site Policy (see [A2](#), pages 218-219). See also Topic Paper Policy 7.1 Norwich and Urban Fringe ([D3.9](#))

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

113. The availability of site HEL2 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground/Delivery Statement agreed with the promoter ([D2.68](#))

114. The viability of site HEL2 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).

115. The deliverability of site HEL2 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:

- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
- Statement of Common Ground ([D2.68](#))
- Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))

116. As stated on page 67 of Appendix 4 to Topic Paper Policy 1 Growth Strategy ([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 3

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

Response to question 3

117. The policy requirements for HEL2 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Broadland Local Plan (2016) allocation ([C1.2](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with district colleagues and consultation.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

118. Not applicable to HEL2

Site: Land south and east of Easton (Ref EAS 1). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

119. The site was allocated in 2015 as part of the South Norfolk Local Plan ([C1.7](#)) but has not yet been developed. The principle of development on the site has already been accepted and it is expected that development will take place within the time-period of this local plan up to 2038.

120. The site has outline planning permission for 890 units, but this does not cover the whole of the allocation. (At the time of writing) a separate application for 64 dwellings is under consideration at the time of preparing this plan on some of the remaining allocated land, north of Dereham Road. In addition, (at the time of writing) it was considered that there is capacity for an additional 90 dwellings on the last parcel of allocated land, to the east of Easton Gymnastics Club (This has now been approved). The site is therefore re-allocated for residential development and has been considered in the calculation of the housing requirement for a total of 1,044 units. It is recognised that a number of the Policy requirements will have already been met through the planning consent on the site.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

121. The availability of site EAS1 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground/Delivery Statement agreed with the promoter ([D2.66](#))
122. The viability of site EAS1 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
123. The deliverability of site EAS1 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground / Delivery Statement ([D2.66](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
124. As stated on page 65 of Appendix 4 to Topic Paper Policy 1 Growth Strategy ([D3.2](#)) states that 40 homes will be built on the main site by Persimmon Homes in 2021/2, with 80 homes delivered per year subsequently, so that the 890 homes will be completed by 2032/33. The 64 dwellings on the Orbit/ESCO site are assumed to be delivered between 2023/4 and 2025/6. The remainder of the allocation not permitted for housing (adjacent to Easton Gymnastics Club) now has permission for a Department for Education Special Educational Needs School (Norfolk County Application ref. FUL/2020/0110), Consequently, the GNLP site allocation policy could be considered by the Inspectors for amendment as a **main modification to reduce the housing numbers from 1,044 to 954 dwellings and to include the school site as part of the allocation** (see also pages 41,102 of the Norwich and the Urban Fringe topic paper ([D3.9](#)))
125. 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 3

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

Response to question 3

126. The policy requirements for EAS1 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the South Norfolk Local Plan allocation ([C1.7](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with district colleagues and consultation comments (see Statement of Consultation [A8.1](#) and [8.20](#) associated appendices). In the case

of site EAS1 an additional policy requirement is made with respect to the need to conserve and enhance the significance of heritage asset and setting of heritage assets of St Peter's Church as per the comments made by Historic England. The position has been agreed through a Statement of Common Ground with Historic England (see [\(B4.3\)](#)). In addition, a requirement to comply with the waste core strategy policy CS16 has been added in response to comments made by Minerals and Waste team.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

127. With regards to the uplift, capacity, or extension to the sites as stated on page 65 of Appendix 4 to Topic Paper Policy 1 Growth Strategy ([D3.2](#)) the 890 homes will be completed by 2032/33. The 64 dwellings on the Orbit/ESCO site are assumed to be delivered between 2023/4 and 2025/6. The remainder of the allocation not permitted for housing (adjacent to Easton Gymnastics Club) now has permission for a Department for Education Special Educational Needs School (Norfolk County Application ref. FUL/2020/0110), Consequently, the GNLP site allocation policy could be considered by the Inspectors for amendment as a **main modification to reduce the housing numbers from 1,044 to 954 dwellings and to include the school site as part of the allocation** (see also pages 41,102 of the Norwich and the Urban Fringe topic paper ([D3.9](#))). Therefore, the current position is justified and supported by the evidence mentioned above.

Site: Land east of Cator Road and north of Hall Lane, Drayton (Ref DRA1). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

128. The site was allocated in 2016 as part of the Broadland Local Plan ([C1.2](#)) but has not yet been developed. The principle of development on the site has already been accepted and it is expected that development will take place within the time-period of the new local plan up to 2038. The site is likely to accommodate at least 250 homes reflecting planning permission 20161066 resolution to grant outline approval subject to the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement. (at the time of writing the site now benefits from full planning consent) (see [A2](#), pages 206-207)

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

129. The availability of site DRA1 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground/Delivery Statement agreed with the promoter ([D2.65](#)).
130. The viability of site DRA1 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).
131. The deliverability of site DRA1 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:
- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
 - Statement of Common Ground ([D2.65](#))
 - Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))
132. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For DRA1 it states that 40-48 units per annum will be delivered in the period beyond 2023, as confirmed in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#).
133. 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 3

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

Response to question 3

134. The policy requirements for DRA1 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Broadland Local Plan allocation ([C1.2](#)) and amended as appropriate in response to consultation comments (see Statement of Consultation [A8.1](#) and [8.20](#) associated appendices). In the case of site DRA1 an additional requirement has been added with respect to the historic environment as per comments made from Historic England. The position has been agreed through a Statement of Common Ground with Historic England (see ([B4.3](#))).

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

135. Not applicable

Site: Land on White Horse Lane and to the rear of Charolais Close & Devon Way (Ref TROW1). Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

136. The site comprises a first phase including a total of 98 dwellings and a primary school which are under construction. The second phase of development is pending completion of the Section 106 agreement at the time of writing and comprises 83 dwellings and 0.4ha of land set a side to facilitate expansion of the primary school site. 3.84 The principle of development on the site has already been accepted and it is expected that the development will be completed within the time-period of this local plan to 2038. As an existing allocation it has been considered in the calculation of the housing requirement for 181 homes (see [A2](#), pages 252-254).

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

137. The availability of site TROW1 is confirmed through a Statement of Common Ground/Delivery Statement agreed with the promoter ([D2.76](#))

138. The viability of site DRA1 has been assessed through the use of typologies in the Viability Appraisal ([B26.3](#)).

139. The deliverability of site TROW1 is demonstrated in a number of different documents:

- Housing Trajectory ([D3.2C](#))
- Statement of Common Ground ([D2.76](#))
- Site Delivery Table ([D1.5](#))

140. [D1.3A](#) gives a commentary on the delivery of carried forward allocations. For TROW1 it states that 25 units per annum will be delivered in the period beyond 2023, as confirmed in the housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#).

141. 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 3

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

Response to question 3

142. The policy requirements for TROW1 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the South Norfolk Local Plan allocation ([C1.7](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with district colleagues and consultation. In the case of site TROW1 an additional requirement has been added with respect to Trowse Conservation Area as per comments made from Historic England. The position has been agreed through a Statement of Common Ground with Historic England (see [B4.3](#)).

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

143. Not applicable to TROW1

Site: Land north Hethersett (Ref HET 1) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

144. HET1 has Outline permission for 1196 dwellings (2011/1804) and subsequent Reserved Matters (RM) approval (2017/0151 - Phase A1-B comprising 91 dwellings, 2017/1104 - Phase B1-B comprising 107 dwellings, 2018/2326 - Phase A2

comprising 181 dwellings and 2018/2500 - Phase B2 comprising 191 dwellings) all of which are under construction,

145. In addition, a RM application has been submitted for Phase B3 (2021/1965) for 148 dwellings, this application is pending consideration.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

146. The site-specific delivery assumptions for HET1 are justified. HET1 has been carried forward to incorporate an uplift of 200 home, as outlined in the Policy (see [A2](#), page 335-337). An Outline planning application (2021/1965) has already been submitted to the Council to accommodate the uplift of up to 200 additional units, The developers Consortium (Persimmon Homes (Anglia) and Taylor Wimpey (East Anglia)) have provided an SoCG ([D2.101](#)) confirming it is their intention to bring forward the outstanding development through a Reserved Matters planning application, in due course.

147. The scheme is expected to complete by 2029/30. HET1 is consequently considered a 'deliverable' site under the NPPF definition, and this is reflected in the housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)), with delivery of 130 homes in 2028/29 and 70 homes in 2029/30 projected.

148. The total of reserved matters will accommodate all the 1,396 homes as allocated.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

149. The policy requirements for HET1 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the South Norfolk Local Plan allocation ([C1.7](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with district colleagues, consultation and to accommodate the 200 dwelling uplift. There is no specific site within the larger allocation, so the uplift is applied to the entire site. Due to the size of the original allocation, a range of supporting infrastructure and facilities is required, and the following policy therefore applies to the additional 200 dwellings, wherever they may be located within the site, as outlined in the Policy (see [A2](#), page 335-337)

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

150. The allocation incorporates an 'uplift' of 200 units. The opportunity to accommodate additional numbers has arisen due to the developers being efficient with their layouts and will have delivered the outline consent's residential numbers limit (1,196 units) in phases 1-3 and part of phase 4 of the original consent, leaving development land parcels in phase 4 available for additional development.#
151. Making efficient use of land available is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 124 and 125.

Site: Land to the south of A47 and north of Yarmouth Road, Blofield (Ref BLO1) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

152. BLO1 has Outline permission for up to 175 dwellings (20160488) and a Reserved Matters permission 163 dwellings (20172131).

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

153. The site-specific delivery assumptions for BLO1 are justified. BLO1 is under construction and has already delivered 30 homes in 2019/20 and 74 were completed in 2020/21. The Housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) shows that remaining 32 homes are expected to be delivered in 2021/22 and 27 homes in 2022/23.
154. The evidence shows the site has previously delivered at a consistent rate and it is expected that development will complete within the time period of this local plan up to 2038.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

155. The policy requirements for BLO1 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been taken from the Broadland Local Plan allocation ([C1.2](#)) and amended as appropriate following discussion with district colleagues and consultation and updated.
156. An additional policy amendment allows for more homes may be accommodated, subject to an acceptable design and layout, as well as infrastructure constraints, as outlined in the Policy (see [A2](#), page 325-326).

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

157. No applicable to BLO1, there is no proposed uplift in capacity or extension to the site.

Site: Land to the north of Norwich Road, Acle (Ref ACL1) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

158. ACL1 has planning permission for 137 homes (20191215).

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

159. The site was allocated in 2016 as part of the current Broadland Local Plan ([C1.2](#)) and has permission for 137 homes (20191215). The scheme is expected to be completed by 2025/26. BLO1 is consequently considered a 'deliverable' site under the NPPF definition, and this is reflected in the housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)), with

delivery of 20 homes in 2021/22, 34 homes in 2022/23, 2023/24 and 2024/25 and 18 homes in 2025/26 projected.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

160. The policy requirements for ACL1 are justified and effective. The policy wording has been amended as appropriate to reflect the extant planning permissions on site, including discussions with district colleagues and consultation. The existing site was previously allocated for 120-150 homes. The site is now being allocated for up to 140 homes. An additional policy amendment has included to allow for additional homes to be accommodated on site, subject to acceptable design and layout, as well as infrastructure constraints, as outlined in the Policy (see [A2](#), page 315-316).

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

161. No applicable to ACL1 there is no proposed uplift in capacity or extension to the site.

Site: Land at former station yard, Station Road, Reepham (Ref REP2) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

162. REP2 has planning permission for a 60-bed care home, 20 assisted flats and 15 assisted bungalow (20180963).

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

163. The site-specific delivery assumptions for REP2 are justified. REP2 has been carried forward, as outlined in the Policy (see [A2](#), page 369). A planning application (20180963) has already been approved on the site for a mixed-use development, including a 60 No Bedroom Care Home (C2 Use), 20 No Assisted Flats (C2 Use) and

15 No Assisted Bungalows (C2 Use). The principle of development is already accepted and it is expected that development will take place within the new local plan time-period up to 2038.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

164. The policy requirements for site REP2 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 and updated. In addition, the policy wording has been amended to reflect the changes is Use Class from B1 to E(g).

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

165. REP2 is allocated for approximately 20 homes. Consent has been granted for a 95 unit C2 use, which counted at a ratio of 1:1.8, is equivalent to 53 dwellings. This is an uplift of 33 units on site.

Site: Land south of Acle Station, between Reedham Road and New Reedham Road, Acle (Ref ACL2) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

166. ACL2 has planning permission for 30 dwelling 20180941.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

167. The site was allocated in 2016 as part of the Broadland Local Plan ([C1.2](#)) and has permission for 30 homes (20180941). The scheme is currently being progressed by

the developer Crocus Contractors and is expected to be completed by 2021/22. ACL2 is consequently considered a 'deliverable' site under the NPPF definition, and this is reflected in the housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)), which shows the 30 unit allocation to be delivered in 2021/22.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

168. The policy requirements for site ACL2 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 and updated. In addition, the policy wording has been amended to reflect the changes is Use Class from B1 to E(g).

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

169. Not applicable to ACL2

Site: Land to the north of Blofield Corner, Blofield Heath (Ref BLO5) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

170. The site was granted outline planning permission under 20140968 with reserved matters consent granted under 20162199. Applications for discharge of conditions have been made and granted under 20181132 (energy and nest boxes) and 20190790 (pumping station, noise levels, roads, footways and foul and surface water drainage). The site is owned by Bennett Homes who have made a technical start on site and paid the initial instalments of their CIL charge.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

171. The site is shown in the housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) as delivering 18 homes in 2021/22 and 18 homes in 2022/23 and this is considered to be justified as it is broadly in line with recent information supplied to South Norfolk and Broadland Council by Bennett Homes which states that they expect the first 18 homes to be completed in 2022/23 and the last 18 in 2023/24. The site is clearly deliverable within the plan period to 2038 and also falls within the NPPF definition of developable

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

172. The policy requirements for BLO5 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. The policy requirements both relate to highways and access which has been addressed through conditions attached to the planning permission.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

173. Not applicable for BLO5.

Site: Land east of Manor Road, Newton St Faith (Ref HNF1) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

174. The site has full planning permission for 68 homes (20182043). The site has commenced and is being developed by Lovell.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

175. The site is shown in the housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) as having delivered 3 homes in the period 2020/21, with an expectation of a further 30 homes in 2021/22 and 35 homes in 2022/23. This is considered to be justified as it is line with recent information supplied to South Norfolk and Broadland Council by Lovell that they expect the first tranche of 34 homes to be completed in 2021/22 with the site built out in 2022/23. The site is clearly deliverable within the plan period to 2038 and also falls within the NPPF definition of developable.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

176. The policy requirements for HNF1 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 conserve and enhance the significance of the grade II listed Middle Farmhouse and Granary to the east of the site following representations made by Historic England.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

177. Not applicable for HNF1.

Site: Land at Rectory Road, Coltishall (Ref COL1) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

178. The site was granted outline consent in 2017 (20170075) for 30 dwellings which has now lapsed. A full application for 30 dwellings (20201627) was considered at

Broadland District Council Planning Committee 26 January 2022. The members voted to delegate authority to approve subject to satisfactory completion of a Section 106 agreement relating to policy compliant affordable housing, policy compliant green infrastructure and recreational open space provision with a footpath link to the Bure Valley Walk and the setting up of a management company for managing and maintaining the onsite amenity/biodiversity areas. The Section 106 agreement will be likely to take a couple of months to be drafted and finalised before a final decision can be formally issued. This application was for a slightly larger area than just the COL1 allocation and extended into site GNLP2019 as well.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

179. The housing trajectory at [D3.2C](#) predicts delivery of 30 dwellings on site in 2022/23. This is in accordance with the Statement of Common Ground ([D1.121](#)) which has been prepared jointly for sites COL1 and GNLP2019 which states that both sites together will deliver a minimum of 50 dwellings within the next 1-5 years. The recent approval of application 20201627 at the Broadland District Council Planning Committee on 26th January 2022 gives further weight to this prediction.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

180. The policy requirements for COL1 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 GNLP2019.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

181. Not applicable for COL1.

Site: Land to the rear of Burlingham Road/St Marys Close, South Walsham (Ref SWA1) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

182. The planning permission on this site (20161643) has expired. However the site promoter Norfolk County Council has providing an SoCG ([D2.139](#)) indicating their intent to bring forward the development as one cohesive scheme with adjacent allocated site GNLP0382 which is also within their ownership using the council's own development company Repton Property Developments Ltd.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

183. Norfolk County Council has provided a combined SoCG for sites SWA1 and GNLP0382 ([D2.139](#)) indicating their intent to bring forward the development as a cohesive whole. Their intention is to submit a planning application in 2022 using the council's own development company, Repton Property Developments Ltd. This could lead to a start on site in 2023/24 and completion of all 45 homes across both sites in 2025/26, based on a build out rate of 20 homes per annum. The SoCG gives confidence that the site is developable within the plan period however a cautious approach is being taken in the housing trajectory ([D3.2C](#)) with delivery on SWA1 projected from 2026/27. As allocating GNLP0382 facilitates access to SWA1, which is also owned by Norfolk County Council, there is a good prospect of these timescales being achieved.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

184. The policy requirements for SWA1 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 for access to be made available to GNLP0382.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

185. Not applicable for SWA1.

Site: Land north of Palmer's Lane, Freethorpe (Ref FRE1) Are the proposed site allocations listed below soundly based? In particular:

Question 1

Does the site still benefit from an extant planning permission for housing development?

Response to question 1

186. The site was granted planning consent in 2019 (20181845) with 8 of 9 units recorded as being complete as at December 2021. The remaining dwelling has commenced on site.

Question 2

Are the site specific delivery assumptions justified?

Response to question 2

187. The site was granted planning consent in 2019 (20181845) with 8 of 9 units recorded as being complete as at December 2021. The remaining dwelling has commenced on site.

Question 3

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

Response to question 3

188. The policy requirements for FRE1 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 site is now virtually complete with the 8 out of 9 dwellings recorded as being complete as at December 2021.

Question 4

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

Response to question 4

189. Not applicable for FRE1.