

Main Modifications – Sites

List of sites with representations:

Norwich

- MM22 - Policy GNLP0360/3053/R10 – East Norwich Strategic Regeneration Area
- MM23 - Policy GNLP0068 – Land adjacent to the River Wensum and the Premier Inn, Duke Street
- MM26 - Policy GNLP0133DR – Land between Suffolk Walk and Bluebell Road
- MM28 - Policy GNLP0401 – Former Eastern Electricity Headquarters (Duke's Wharf), Duke Street
- MM29 - Policy GNLP0409AR – Land at Whitefriars
- MM30 - Policy GNLP0409BR – Land south of Barrack Street
- MM31 - Policy GNLP0451 – Land adjoining Sentinel House (St Catherine's Yard), Surrey Street
- MM32 - Policy GNLP0506 – Land at and adjoining Anglia Square
- MM33 - Policy GNLP1061R – Land known as 'site 4', Norwich Airport
- MM34 - Policy GNLP2114 – Land at and adjoining St Georges Works, Muspole Street
- MM35 - Policy GNLP2163 – Friars Quay Car Park, Colegate
- MM37 - Policy GNLP3054 – Site at St Mary's Works and St Mary's House
- MM39 - Policy CC3 – 10-14 Ber Street
- MM40 - Policy CC4a – Land at Rose Lane/Mountergate
- MM41 - Policy CC4b – Land Mountergate/Prince of Wales Road
- MM42 - Policy CC7 – Hobrough Street, King Street
- MM43 - Policy CC8 – King Street Stores
- MM44 - Policy CC10 – Land at Garden Street and Rouen Road
- MM45 - Policy CC11 – Argyle Street

- MM47 - Policy CC15 – Norwich Mail Centre, 13-17 Thorpe Road
- MM48 - Policy CC16 – Land adjoining Norwich City Football Club north and east of Geoffrey Watling Way
- MM49 - Policy CC18(CC19) – Land at 150-154 Oak Street and 70-72 Sussex Street
- MM50 - Policy CC24 – Land to rear of City Hall
- MM51 - Policy CC30 – Westwick Street Car Park
- MM52 - Policy R1 – Land at The Neatmarket, Hall Road
- MM55 - Policy R13 – Site of former Gas Holder at Gas Hill
- MM56 - Policy R14/15 – Land at Ketts Hill and east of Bishop Bridge Road
- MM62 - Policy R30 – Land at Holt Road
- MM63 - Policy R31 – Heigham Water Treatment Works, Waterworks Road
- MM64 - Policy R36 – Mile Cross Depot
- MM65 - Policy R37 – The Norwich Community Hospital Site, Bowthorpe Road

Urban Fringe

- MM70 – Policy COL1/GNLP0331BR & GNLP0331CR – Land adjacent to Norwich Research Park (NRP), Colney
- MM71 – Policy COL2/GNLP0401C – Land rear/east of Institute of Food Research (IFR), Colney
- MM72 – Policy GNLP0253 – Colney Hall, Watton Road, Colney
- MM74 – Policy COL3/GNLPSL2008 – Longwater Employment Area, Costessey
- MM76 – Paragraphs 3.20 and 3.21
- MM78 – Policy GNLP0307/GNLP0327 – Land north of the A11, Cringleford
- MM79 – Policy KES2/GNLP0497 – Land west of Ipswich Road, Keswick
- MM80 – Policy DRA1 – Land east of Cator Road and north of Hall Lane, Drayton
- MM81 – Policy EAS1 – Land south and east of Easton
- MM82 – Policy HEL1 – Land at Hospital Grounds, southwest of Drayton Road, Hellesdon
- MM83 – Policy HEL2 – Land at the Royal Norwich Golf Club, either side of Drayton High Road, Hellesdon

- MM84 – Policy HEL4/GNLP1019 – Land northeast of Reepham Road, Hellesdon
- MM85 – Policy GNLP0172 – Land to the west of Green Lane West, Rackheath
- MM87 – Policy GNLP0132 – Land off Blue Boar Lane/Salhouse Road, White House Farm, Sprowston
- MM88 – Policy GNLP0337R – Land between Fir Covert Road and Reepham Road, Taverham
- MM89 – Policy GNLP0159R – Land off Beech Avenue, Taverham
- MM90 – Policy TROW1 – Land on White Horse Lane and to the rear of Charolais Close & Devon Way, Trowse

Main Towns

- MM92– Policy GNLP0596R – Land at Norwich Road, Aylsham
- MM93 – Policy GNLP0102 – Land at Frontier Agriculture Ltd, Sandy Lane, Diss
- MM94 – Policy GNLP2108 – Land South of Spirketts Lane, Harleston
- MM98 – Policy HAR7 – Land south of Spirketts Lane, Harleston
- MM99 – Policy GNLP2109 – South of Hethel Industrial Estate, Bracon Ash
- MM100– Policy HETHEL2 – Land South and South West of Lotus Cars, Hethel

Key Service Centres

- MM103– Policy GNLP0378R/GNLP2139R – Land west of Acle (north of Norwich Road, south of South Walsham Road), Acle
- MM107 – Policy BLO1 – Land to the south of A47 and north of Yarmouth Road, Blofield
- MM109 – Policy BRU3 – Land east of the Memorial Hall, Brundall
- MM110 – Policy HET1/Part of GNLP0177A – Land north of Hethersett
- MM111 – Policy HET2 – Land north of Grove Road, Hethersett
- MM113 – Policy GNLP0520 – Land south of Norwich Road, Hingham
- MM114 – Policy HIN2 – Land adjacent to Hingham Industrial Estate at Ironside Way, Hingham
- MM115 – Policy GNLP0312 – Land to the east of Beccles Road, Loddon
- MM116 – Policy GNLP0463R – Land off Langley Road, Chedgrave
- MM117 – Policy LOD3 – Land adjacent to Loddon Industrial Estate, Little Money Road, Loddon

MM118 – Policy POR3 – Ex MOD site, Pine Loke, Poringland

MM119 – Policy REP1 – Land off Broomhill Lane, Reepham

Broadland Village Clusters

MM124 – Policy GNLP0293 and CAW2 – Land east of Gayford Road, Cawston

MM127 – Policy GNLP2019 and COL1 – Land at Rectory Road, Coltishall

MM128 – Policy COL2 – Land at Jordan’s Scrapyard, Coltishall

MM129 – Policy GNLP0605 – Land west of Foundry Close, Foulsham

MM130 – Policy FOU2 – Land at Old Railway Yard, Station Road, Foulsham

MM132 – Policy FRE1 – Land north of Palmer’s Lane, Freethorpe

MM133 – Policy GNLP0608R – Land at Bridge Farm Field, St Faiths Close, Great Witchingham

MM135 – Policy GNLP0125R – Land to the west of West Lane, Horsham St Faith

MM136 – Policy HNF1 – Land east of Manor Road, Newton St Faith

MM137 – Policy HNF2/GNLP0466R – Land east of the A140 and north of Norwich International Airport, Horsham St Faith

MM139 – Policy GNLP0380 – West of Blofield Road, Lingwood

MM141 – Policy GNLP2143 – Land south of Le Neve Road, Marsham

MM142 – Policy GNLP1001 – Land to east of Station Road, Reedham

MM144 – Policy GNLP0188 – Land adjoining Norwich Road, Salhouse

South Norfolk Village Employment sites

MM148 – Policy BKE3 – Brooke Industrial Estate

Costessey Contingency Site

MM149 – Policy GNLP0581/2043 - Costessey Contingency Site

Gypsy and Traveller Sites

MM150 – Policy GNLP5004R – Land off Buxton Road, Eastgate, Cawston

MM151 – Policy GNLP5022 – The Oaks, Land off Reepham Road, Foulsham

MM154 – Policy GNLP5020 – Romany Meadow, The Turnpike, Carleton Rode

MM155– Policy GNLP5024 – Upgate Street, Carleton Rode

MM157 – Policy GNLP5028A/B – Land at Strayground Lane, Wymondham

Norwich

MM22 - Policy GNLP0360/3053/R10 – East Norwich Strategic Regeneration Area

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Anglian Water Services Ltd (Ms Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [20121]	25425	Comment	Support amendment 1a. that requires development to be guided and informed by the East Norwich Strategic Regeneration Area SPD.	No No changes to modification M22 are suggested.	No Change Comments noted. No change to modification M22 in relation to these comments.
Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Sarah Eglington, Planning and Advocacy Advisor) [20730]	25508	Comment	Point 13a: states that <i>“Development must allow scope for greater use of the Rivers Wensum and Yare for water-based recreation, leisure and tourism including the potential inclusion of marinas and riverside moorings”</i> . We recommend that additional text is added to stipulate that this would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation value of these rivers. We support the addition of	Yes Add text on nature conservation for the Rivers Yare and Wensum to modification M22.	Potential Change Comments noted. It is not considered necessary to amend the modification on point 13a as policy 3 covers nature conservation. However, the partnership would have no objection to the suggested additional policy text being added.

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			text outlining the need for new developments for all sites within ENSRA to include high-quality pedestrian and cycle routes.		
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25306	Object	<p>Historic England welcomes some of the changes made to this policy. The policy is now clearer and has increased protection for the historic environment. We welcome references to locally distinctive design, conservation and long-term management of the bottle kiln, heritage interpretation of the Carrow Works site and heritage significance at the Utilities site.</p> <p>However, most of the recommendations that we made in our Hearing Statement and at the EiP in July 2022 have</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>We suggest that criterion 6 of the policy is replaced with the following:</p> <p><i>6 Development should conserve, or where appropriate enhance, the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets both on-site and nearby (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset). Designated assets in and around the site include Carrow Abbey and St Andrews Church (both GI) Carrow House Conservatory (GI*) and numerous GI listed buildings, Carrow Priory</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>Response to points made relating to Criterion 6:</p> <p>We consider that the wording of criterion 6 is sound and is more precise than that which is proposed by Historic England. We do not feel that it is necessary to list the heritage assets within the policy but would suggest part vii of the supplementary text could be expanded to include this as follows:</p> <p>(vii): <i>Parts of the East Norwich Strategic Regeneration Area are situated within Trowse</i></p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>not been incorporated into the policy which is disappointing.</p> <p>The policy does not reference Crown Point RPG, it doesn't give sufficient detail on heritage mitigation and enhancement and it fails to provide sufficient detail in relation to archaeological requirements for the site. For these reasons, the policy as written is not effective and not consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Therefore, we continue to recommend the following:</p> <p>We suggest that criterion 6 of the policy is replaced with the following:</p> <p><i>6 Development should</i></p>	<p><i>scheduled monument, Bracondale and Trowse Millgate Conservation Areas and Crown Point Registered Park and Garden (GII). Great weight should be given to the conservation of designated assets. Development should include a range of heritage mitigation and enhancement measures identified through the SPD and masterplan including (but not only): a) Repair and re-use of heritage assets; including provision for their longterm maintenance/management; b) Protection of views from key views into and from the site including from Crown Points RGG across the City, St Andrews Church and the interconnection between the Abbey and Carrow House and from key heritage assets across the City; c) Draw upon local character and</i></p>	<p><i>Millgate Conservation Area and Bracondale Conservation Area and there are is a high concentration of heritage assets in and adjacent to the sites which includes Carrow Abbey and St Andrews Church (both Grade I) Carrow House Conservatory (Grade II*), numerous Grade II listed buildings, Carrow Priory scheduled monument and Crown Point Registered Park and Garden (Grade II).</i></p> <p>In terms of heritage mitigation and enhancement measures, this is covered within the policy. Long term maintenance/management of the bottle kiln is covered within the Deal Ground section. Long-term management of heritage assets on Carrow Works</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p><i>conserve, or where appropriate enhance, the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets both on-site and nearby (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset). Designated assets in and around the site include Carrow Abbey and St Andrews Church (both GI) Carrow House Conservatory (GII*) and numerous GII listed buildings, Carrow Priory scheduled monument, Bracondale and Trowse Millgate Conservation Areas and Crown Point Registered Park and Garden (GII). Great weight should be given to the conservation of designated assets. Development should include a range of heritage mitigation and</i></p>	<p><i>distinctiveness; d) Protect and enhance the Broads.</i></p>	<p>is covered in the Carrow Works section. We do not consider that it is necessary for soundness, or beneficial to duplicate these points here and propose retaining the wording as per the consultation.</p> <p>Regarding key views from and into the site; Criteria 6 already refers to this. Additional detail within the policy is not considered to be necessary for soundness purposes. If a list were to be included, any suggested views should be clear that these could be added to as necessary and are not perhaps a definitive list. It is considered that further detail is a matter which will be more appropriately dealt with through the SPD and considered in the review</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<i>enhancement measures identified through the SPD and masterplan including (but not only): a) Repair and re-use of heritage assets; including provision for their longterm maintenance/management; b) Protection of views from key views into and from the site including from Crown Points RGG across the City, St Andrews Church and the interconnection between the Abbey and Carrow House and from key heritage assets across the City; c) Draw upon local character and distinctiveness; d) Protect and enhance the Broads.</i>		of planning applications. Regarding 'protect and enhance the Broads' we consider that the existing proposed wording to consider the 'impact upon the Broads' allows a full breadth of issues to be considered; we do not feel that the suggested wording to protect and enhance is an improvement or sufficiently clear relating to what would be protected and enhanced.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment	25306	Object	Recommended changes to policy wording for Criterion 12: <i>12 Archaeological investigations are required in those areas of</i>	Yes Recommended changes to policy wording for Criterion 12: <i>12 Archaeological</i>	Potential Change Response to points made relating to Criterion 12: The proposed wording by

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Planning Adviser) [19652]			<i>the site not previously subject to archaeological evaluation. These should be carried out prior to the determination of any planning application. The scope of any archaeological works should be agreed with Norfolk County Council (and Historic England where necessary in relation to the Scheduled Monument).</i>	<i>investigations are required in those areas of the site not previously subject to archaeological evaluation. These should be carried out prior to the determination of any planning application. The scope of any archaeological works should be agreed with Norfolk County Council (and Historic England where necessary in relation to the Scheduled Monument).</i>	Historic England is a lot longer so not consistent with other policies. One of the main differences is that this requires archeological investigations prior to the determination of applications rather than prior to development. It is not considered necessary to make an amendment for soundness. For context, comments received by the LPA on the current Carrow Works planning application from Historic Environment Service include a suggested pre-commencement condition rather than pre-determination. Historic England would have control over any works within the area of the scheduled monument, which would be expected to be minimal. For other parts of the site large

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
					<p>areas are covered by buildings and hard standing and therefore a pre-determination requirement for archaeology may be difficult. If there is a high likelihood of finding things of significance it may be appropriate for some investigations to be carried out up front, with consideration in more targeted areas of the site guided by Historic England and Historic Environment Service.</p> <p>Therefore, in response to this issue the partnership acknowledges that whilst the existing wording does not preclude archaeological assessment prior to determination, an alternative amendment is put forward for the Inspector's consideration:</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
					12. An appropriate archaeological assessment will be required to inform any proposals for development prior to development
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25306	Object	<p>Recommended changes to policy wording for Deal Ground/May Gurney Section</p> <p>Additional new criterion for Deal Ground/May Gurney</p> <p><i>Provision of open space to the north of St Andrews Church to provide an appropriate open setting with links to the wider landscape beyond</i></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Recommended changes to policy wording for Deal Ground/May Gurney Section</p> <p>Additional new criterion for Deal Ground/May Gurney</p> <p><i>Provision of open space to the north of St Andrews Church to provide an appropriate open setting with links to the wider landscape beyond</i></p>	<p>No Change</p> <p><u>Deal Ground/May Gurney:</u> Saint Andrew's Church is not part of the ENSRA Site; it is separated by a road, river, and numerous trees. The Deal Ground has limited options for development, and this is an unnecessary additional constraint, there is an existing extant consent for this site which includes development in this location. Scale and grain of development in this location is to be dealt with in the East Norwich SPD, specifically</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
					regarding the context of St Andrews Church.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25306	Object	<p>Recommended changes to policy wording for Carrow Works section To be added to criterion 1 for Carrow Works section</p> <p><i>Development to the north and east of the Abbey Gardens should be of a height which would not to visually impinge on the gardens. There should be no new built development south of the Abbey and around the Stables and Lodge buildings.</i></p> <p><i>There should be suitable landscaping to enhance the significance of the highly graded Carrow Abbey and reinstate the historic garden and approach to the Abbey; protection for the historic</i></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Recommended changes to policy wording for Carrow Works section To be added to criterion 1 for Carrow Works section</p> <p><i>Development to the north and east of the Abbey Gardens should be of a height which would not to visually impinge on the gardens. There should be no new built development south of the Abbey and around the Stables and Lodge buildings. There should be suitable landscaping to enhance the significance of the highly graded Carrow Abbey and reinstate the historic garden and approach to the Abbey;</i></p>	<p>No Change</p> <p><u>Carrow Works:</u> It is not considered necessary to revise the wording for soundness purposes.</p> <p>Regarding building heights – we agree that new development’s height should not negatively affect the tranquil character of the Scheduled monument and its setting, or any significant views. The draft SPD currently suggests that Heritage Impact assessments /visual assessments are necessary to support proposals to ensure that new buildings won’t affect the significance/setting of heritage assets. We also agree (and this has been</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			environment and ensure consistency with national policy.		<p>also mentioned in the draft SPD) that the existing garden setting of heritage assets is an important contributor to their significance and should be preserved and better enhanced, and that any interventions should respect that character.</p> <p>Criteria 5 already sets out that design should be of a scale and form which respects its context and setting. The policy as drafted provides wording to require protection of the Abbey, this is considered to be sufficient for the site allocation policy.</p> <p>The proposed wording regarding how heritage assets are to be protected is considered to be overly prescriptive for the site allocation</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
					<p>policy. This is an important point which is best placed for the detailed work in the SPD.</p> <p>The suggested statements '<i>height that would not visually impinge on the gardens</i>' and '<i>suitable landscaping</i>' would require additional clarification as they do not have sufficient meaning in this context.</p>
Ms Clare Howe (Sport England) [20709]	25387	Comment	Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stage of plan-making as set out in paragraph 104 of the NPPF. To ensure the policy promotes patterns of movement for people, with a focus on active travel networks, as well as public transport, as promoted by paragraph 104(c) of the NPPF, Sport England proposes that the policy	<p>Yes</p> <p>Sport England requests the additional text in red below is included in order to address this:</p> <p><u>1a. Development should be guided and informed by the movement and connectivity framework set out within the SPD. Proposals must enable connectivity and permeability within and between the sites in the strategic regeneration</u></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>Comments noted. This is not considered to be a soundness issue. There are multiple references throughout the policy and supporting text to walking/pedestrian and cycle access. However, if the Inspectors are minded to make the small amendment proposed here by Sport</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			refers to both cycling and walking also. Reference to cycling and walking would align with the foundational principle of Active Design 'Activity for All', and more specifically the theme supporting active travel. The National Design Guide also encourages limiting the impact of car use by prioritising and encouraging walking and cycling, as well as public transport (see paragraph 77 of the National Design Guide).	<u>area and beyond. Proposals should be designed for ease of access to, and by, walking, cycling and public transport, with appropriate bridge provision to ensure the sites are fully permeable by sustainable transport modes. The travel impacts of the sites on the transport network must be appropriately managed. Planning applications must be supported by a comprehensive Transport Assessment which considers the whole of the strategic allocation.</u>	England, the partnership does not object.
Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]	25520	Object	There is a lack of consistency between some policies, because some sites that are near to the Broads mention the Broads in the supporting text or in the policy and others don't. It is not clear why some modifications have been made to some policies and not to others given that the	Yes A reference is needed to the Broads in this policy. Change to: <i>"takes advantage of its riverside context and prominent location within the City Centre Conservation Area and immediately adjacent to the Broads"</i> .	Potential Change Whilst not a matter of soundness, the Partnership has no objection to taking a consistent approach to allocations where the sites share a similar context to the Broads, and the suggestion of

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			context of all the sites in relation to the Broads is the same.	A reference is needed in supporting text to early engagement with the Broads Authority, but it is misleading that the pertinent issues are flood risk and water disposal. Add a change: <i>“As the site lies adjacent to the River Wensum, it is recommended that developers engage in early discussions with the Environment Agency and the Broads Authority”</i> .	making this site allocation consistent with the approach taken for CC4B for land at Mountergate/Prince of Wales Road is supported. The changes proposed would require a main modification by the inspectors and an additional modification to supporting text that the Partnership is content to make.

MM23 - Policy GNLP0068 – Land adjacent to the River Wensum and the Premier Inn, Duke Street

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25307	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 3 and 11 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]	25512	Object	There is a lack of consistency between some policies, because some sites that are near to the Broads mention the Broads in the supporting text or in the policy and others don't. It is not clear why some modifications have been made to some policies and not to others given that the context of all the sites in relation to the Broads is the same.	<p>Yes</p> <p>A reference is needed to the Broads in policy. Change to: <i>“takes advantage of its riverside context and prominent location within the City Centre Conservation Area and immediately adjacent to the Broads”</i>.</p> <p>A reference is needed in supporting text to early engagement with the Broads Authority but it is misleading that the pertinent issues are flood risk and water disposal. Add a change: <i>“As the site lies adjacent to the River Wensum, it is recommended that developers engage in early discussions with the Environment Agency and the Broads Authority”</i>.</p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>Whilst not a matter of soundness, the Partnership has no objection to taking a consistent approach to allocations where the sites share a similar context to the Broads, and the suggestion of making this site allocation consistent with the approach taken for CC4B for land at Mountergate/Prince of Wales Road is supported. The changes proposed would require a main modification by the inspectors and an additional modification to supporting text that the Partnership is content to make.</p>

MM24 - Policy GNLP0133BR – Land adjoining the Enterprise Centre at Earlham Hall

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25308	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2 which provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM26 - Policy GNLP0133DR – Land between Suffolk Walk and Bluebell Road

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25439	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and	Yes We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state: <i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral</i>	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.	<i>will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i>	representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used. The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Yare Valley Society (Mr John Elbro, Chair) [14909]	14909	Object	Object to modification to Para 2.39 which removes the requirement “ <i>any development must include the opening up of new areas for public access as compensation for this loss</i> ”. Development involves	Yes Do not make the modification to remove supporting text in para 2.39	No Change The partnership’s view is that the proposed modification should be retained. This is because point 3 of the policy requires biodiversity enhancements and improved public access to

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>significant loss of public green space in the Yare Valley Green Infrastructure Corridor which is already suffering from heavy public use.</p> <p>For the corridor to be sustainable for human and wildlife needs in future any loss of public green space in one part of the valley should be compensated for by at minimum a matching increase elsewhere in the valley.</p>		<p>University Broad and the green space in the Yare Valley, including walking and cycling routes. The development will also be subject to biodiversity net gain requirements set out in policy 3. Since UEA already provides full public access to its land, there is no practical way that new areas could be opened up for public access as formerly required by para. 2.39.</p>
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25309	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2 which provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM28 - Policy GNLP0401 – Former Eastern Electricity Headquarters (Duke’s Wharf), Duke Street

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25310	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 3 and 10 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.
Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]	25513	Object	There is a lack of consistency between some policies, because some sites that are near to the Broads mention the Broads in the supporting text or in the policy and others don't. It is not clear why some modifications have been made to some policies and not to others given that the context of all the sites in relation to the Broads is the same.	Yes A reference is needed in supporting text to early engagement with the Broads but it is misleading that the pertinent issues are flood risk and water disposal. Add a change: <i>“As the site lies adjacent to the River Wensum, it is recommended that developers engage in early discussions with the Environment Agency and the Broads Authority”</i> .	Potential Change Whilst not a matter of soundness, the Partnership has no objection to taking a consistent approach to allocations where the sites share a similar context to the Broads, and the suggestion of making this site allocation consistent with the approach taken for CC4B for land at Mountergate/Prince of Wales Road is supported. The change proposed requires an additional

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
					modification to supporting text that the Partnership is content to make.

MM29 - Policy GNLP0409AR – Land at Whitefriars

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25311	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 3 and 15 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.
Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]	25516	Object	There is a lack of consistency between some policies, because some sites that are near to the Broads mention the Broads in the supporting text or in the policy and others don't. It is not clear why some modifications have been made to some policies and not to others given that the context of	Yes A reference is needed in supporting text to early engagement with the Broads but it is misleading that the pertinent issues are flood risk and water disposal. Add a change: "As the site lies adjacent to the River Wensum, it is recommended that developers engage in early	Potential Change Whilst not a matter of soundness, the Partnership has no objection to taking a consistent approach to allocations where the sites share a similar context to the Broads, and the suggestion of making this site allocation consistent with the approach taken

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			all the sites in relation to the Broads is the same.	discussions with the Environment Agency and the Broads Authority".	for CC4B for land at Mountergate/Prince of Wales Road is supported. The changes proposed would require a main modification by the inspectors and an additional modification to supporting text that the Partnership is content to make.

MM30 - Policy GNLP0409BR – Land south of Barrack Street

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25312	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 12 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.
CODE Development Planners Ltd (Miss Helen Adcock,	25482	Object	Jarrold & Sons is disappointed that despite representations of objection at every consultation stage of the	Yes <u>1, Allocation text:</u> Land south of Barrack Street (approx. 2.17	Potential Change Objections noted. <u>Point 1:</u>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Director) [12557] on behalf of Jarrold and Sons Ltd [11487]			<p>GNLP and participation in the examination, which have demonstrated that the site is not 'developable' in accordance with the wording of Policy GNLP0409BR (either as originally worded or proposed by the current Modifications) the proposed allocation has not been deleted from the plan or amended in line with Jarrold & Sons suggested wording. Jarrold & Sons is concerned that the wording of the proposed allocation will further delay development of a site.</p> <p>Whilst Jarrold & Sons agree that the site is in a suitable location for housing development, there is not a reasonable prospect that development will come</p>	<p>hectares) is allocated for residential-led mixed-use development. Homes (including residential care homes and elderly persons accommodation), This will include a minimum of 200 homes. Offices and managed workspace, ancillary retail and professional uses, restaurants, cafes and bars, and recreational open space will be accepted as part of a balanced mix of uses across the wider area.</p> <p><u>2. Policy criterion 4:</u> The office element of the scheme should be located to extend and consolidate the existing completed phases of the St James' Place development at Gilders Way;</p> <p><u>3. Policy Criterion 5:</u></p>	<p>This issue was discussed through the examination and the Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented.</p> <p><u>Point 2:</u> The partnership agrees with the suggestion to delete the words 'St James Place' as GNLP0409B is separated from St James place by site GNLP0409A.</p> <p><u>Point 3:</u> Text relating to St James' Court and St James' Mill and St James' Place has already been amended as part of the proposed modifications. Regarding the reference to a private multistorey car park this issue was discussed through the examination</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/ Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>forward in accordance with the wording of Policy GNLP0409BR. Without a modification to the policy wording to accommodate the existing use in a form of a private multi-storey car park, development of the site would not be viable. Therefore, the policy is not 'developable'.</p> <p>The Modifications propose an addition to the policy wording which states: <i>"12. The site is located within The Area of Main Archaeological Interest. An archaeological assessment will be required as part of a planning application."</i> However, the site is outside the Area of Main Archaeological Interest as shown on Norwich City Council's Norwich Local Plan - Policies Map</p>	<p>Provision of integral and well-designed parking areas to serve existing offices at Gilders Way, St James' Court and St James' Mill and St James' Place as well as proposed office users together with segregated areas of residents parking (this could include a private multistorey car park). Car free or low-car housing development in accordance with Policy 2 is appropriate in this location.</p> <p><u>4. policy criterion 12:</u> [MM30] The site is located within The Area of Main Archaeological Interest. An archaeological assessment will be required as part of a planning application.</p> <p><u>5. site policy map:</u> Policy Map GNLP0409BR to identify 'commitment' for the</p>	<p>and the Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented.</p> <p><u>Point 4:</u> Regarding the area of main archaeological interest. Miss Adcock has highlighted an error in drafting, site GNLP0409B is indeed outside of the defined area of main archaeological interest and reference to it for this site is erroneous.</p> <p><u>Point 5:</u> In accordance with Main Modification MAP2: <i>"Update all focus maps throughout the plan to reflect the re-referencing of sites (title and map). Remove commitment layer and associated note."</i> As such extant</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>– City Centre Inset, adopted December 2014. Therefore, the wording of the Modification appears to have been inserted erroneously and should be deleted.</p> <p>There is a factual issue that has been omitted from the Modifications. We consider the Greater Norwich Local Plan Site Allocation Focus Map for Policy GNLP0409BR should include the map layer denoting “<i>commitment* - new and extant permissions at 1st April 2020</i>” in recognition of extant planning permission 08/00538/RM.</p>	<p>area of the site covered by extant planning permission 08/00538/RM for 8,079sqm office space (B1) comprising 198sqm of ancillary retail space.</p>	<p>planning consent commitment will not be shown on any maps in the GNLP.</p>
Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]	25517	Object	<p>There is a lack of consistency between some policies, because some sites that are near to the Broads mention the Broads in the supporting text or in the policy and others don't. It is not clear</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>A reference is needed to the Broads in policy. Change to: “takes advantage of its riverside context and prominent location within the City Centre Conservation</p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>Whilst not a matter of soundness, the Partnership has no objection to taking a consistent approach to allocations where the sites</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>why some modifications have been made to some policies and not to others given that the context of all the sites in relation to the Broads is the same.</p>	<p>Area and immediately adjacent to the Broads”.</p> <p>A reference is needed in supporting text to early engagement with the Broads but it is misleading that the pertinent issues are flood risk and water disposal. Add a change: “As the site lies adjacent to the River Wensum, it is recommended that developers engage in early discussions with the Environment Agency and the Broads Authority”.</p>	<p>share a similar context to the Broads, and the suggestion of making this site allocation consistent with the approach taken for CC4B for land at Mountergate/Prince of Wales Road is supported. The changes proposed would require a main modification by the inspectors and an additional modification to supporting text that the Partnership is content to make.</p>

MM31 - Policy GNLP0451 – Land adjoining Sentinel House (St Catherine’s Yard), Surrey Street

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25313	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 1 and 6 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM32 - Policy GNLP0506 – Land at and adjoining Anglia Square

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25314	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to the second paragraph and criterion 7, 8 and 9 as they provide greater clarity, greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM33 - Policy GNLP1061R – Land known as ‘site 4’, Norwich Airport

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25315	Object	Historic England maintains that the policy should make reference to the heritage assets to the north of the site (see our SOCG2).	<p>Yes</p> <p>Suggest inserting an additional criterion: <i>‘to conserve and enhance the significance of the Horsham St Faith Conservation Area, listed buildings including the Grade I listed Church of the Blessed Virgin and St Andrew and the grade I listed and scheduled Priory as well as numerous grade II listed buildings (including any contribution made to their significance by setting) into the policy.’</i></p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>As set out on page 41 of the SoCG with Historic England – Part 2 Sites Plan (D4.3) The partnership did not object to this additional criterion being added to the policy if necessary for soundness.</p> <p>Through the process of the hearings as part of the examination in public; this issue was not required as a main modification for soundness of the site allocation policy.</p>

MM34 - Policy GNLP2114 – Land at and adjoining St Georges Works, Muspole Street

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25316	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2 and 7 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM35 - Policy GNLP2163 – Friars Quay Car Park, Colegate

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25317	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM37 - Policy GNLP3054 – Site at St Mary’s Works and St Mary’s House

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25318	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2 and 13 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM39 - Policy CC3 – 10-14 Ber Street

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25319	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 3 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM40 - Policy CC4a – Land at Rose Lane/Mountergate

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
<p>Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]</p>	<p>25440</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		Inspectors were minded to do so.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25320	Support	<p>Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 3, 4 and 8 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.</p> <p>We also welcome the proposed change to Para 2.121 in relation to Conservation Area and Area of Main Archaeological Interest.</p>	No	<p>No Change</p> <p>Support noted.</p>

MM41 - Policy CC4b – Land Mountergate/Prince of Wales Road

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/ Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25321	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 3, 4 and 13 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.
Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]	25514	Object	There is a lack of consistency between some policies, because some sites that are near to the Broads mention the Broads in the supporting text or in the policy and others don't. It is not clear why some modifications have been made to some policies and not to others given that the context of all the sites in relation to the Broads is the same.	No This policy is drafted correctly and other policies should be made consistent with it.	No Change The comment is noted and consequential changes to other policies to achieve a consistent approach are supported.

MM42 - Policy CC7 – Hobrough Street, King Street

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25322	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 3 and 9 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.
Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]	25518	Object	There is a lack of consistency between some policies, because some sites that are near to the Broads mention the Broads in the supporting text or in the policy and others don't. It is not clear why some modifications have been made to some policies and not to others given that the context of all the sites in relation to the Broads is the same.	Yes A reference is needed to the Broads in policy. Change to: "takes advantage of its riverside context and prominent location within the City Centre Conservation Area and immediately adjacent to the Broads".	Potential Change Whilst not a matter of soundness, the Partnership has no objection to taking a consistent approach to allocations where the sites share a similar context to the Broads, and the suggestion of making this site allocation consistent with the approach taken for CC4B for land at Mountergate/Prince of Wales Road is supported. The change proposed would require a main modification by the inspectors.

MM43 - Policy CC8 – King Street Stores

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25323	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25324	Object	In SOCG2 (p 11) GNLP had proposed a modification to include the following wording: The site is located within The Area of Main Archaeological Interest. An archaeological assessment will be required as part of a planning application. The policy should be amended to include this wording as agreed and for consistency with other	Yes Add criterion to read: <i>The site is located within The Area of Main Archaeological Interest. An archaeological assessment will be required as part of a planning application.</i>	Potential Change The amendment is not considered to be necessary for soundness purposes; however for the purpose of consistency with other site allocation policies in the area of main archaeological interest in Norwich, the partnership does not have any objection to this additional criterion being added to the policy. This is consistent with other local and national

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			policies in the Plan and national policy.		policy as set out on pages 11-12 of the SoCG with Historic England – Part 2 Sites Plan (D4.3).
Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]	25519	Object	There is a lack of consistency between some policies, because some sites that are near to the Broads mention the Broads in the supporting text or in the policy and others don't. It is not clear why some modifications have been made to some policies and not to others given that the context of all the sites in relation to the Broads is the same.	Yes A reference is needed in supporting text to early engagement with the Broads but it is misleading that the pertinent issues are flood risk and water disposal. Add a change: "As the site lies adjacent to the River Wensum, it is recommended that developers engage in early discussions with the Environment Agency and the Broads Authority".	Potential Change Whilst not a matter of soundness, the Partnership has no objection to taking a consistent approach to allocations where the sites share a similar context to the Broads, and the suggestion of making this site allocation consistent with the approach taken for CC4B for land at Mountergate/Prince of Wales Road is supported. The change proposed requires an additional modification to supporting text that the Partnership is content to make.

MM44 - Policy CC10 – Land at Garden Street and Rouen Road

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25325	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM45 - Policy CC11 – Argyle Street

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25326	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 1 and 3 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM47 - Policy CC15 – Norwich Mail Centre, 13-17 Thorpe Road

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25327	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 1 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM48 - Policy CC16 – Land adjoining Norwich City Football Club north and east of Geoffrey Watling Way

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25464	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and	Yes We consider that for the site that is within a mineral infrastructure site consultation area the policy wording should state: <i>“The site is within the consultation area for safeguarded mineral infrastructure; therefore, the development must not</i>	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.	<i>prevent or prejudice the use of the existing safeguarded infrastructure for those purposes unless suitable alternative provision is made, or the applicant demonstrates that the site no longer meets the needs of the aggregate industry”.</i>	representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used. The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25328	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]	25515	Object	There is a lack of consistency between some policies, because some sites that are near to the Broads mention the Broads in the supporting text or in the policy and others don't. It is not clear why some modifications have been made to some policies and not to others given that the context of all the sites in relation to the Broads is the same.	Yes A reference is needed to the Broads in policy. Change to: "takes advantage of its riverside context and prominent location within the City Centre Conservation Area and immediately adjacent to the Broads".	Potential Change Whilst not a matter of soundness, the Partnership has no objection to taking a consistent approach to allocations where the sites share a similar context to the Broads, and the suggestion of making this site allocation consistent with the approach taken for CC4B for land at Mountergate/Prince of Wales Road is supported. The change proposed requires an additional modification to supporting text that the Partnership is content to make.

MM49 - Policy CC18(CC19) – Land at 150-154 Oak Street and 70-72 Sussex Street

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25329	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 1 and 3 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM50 - Policy CC24 – Land to rear of City Hall

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25330	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 7 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM51 - Policy CC30 – Westwick Street Car Park

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25331	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2 and 6 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM52 - Policy R1 – Land at The Neatmarket, Hall Road

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25441	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the	Yes We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state: <i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction</i>	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.</p>	<p><i>to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.</p>

MM55 - Policy R13 – Site of former Gas Holder at Gas Hill

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25332	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM56 - Policy R14/15 – Land at Ketts Hill and east of Bishop Bridge Road

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25333	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM62 - Policy R30 – Land at Holt Road

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25442	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
David Utting Engineering Limited [20715]	25422	Object	Removal of the northern paddock from allocation R30 is not justified or effective making the plan unsound. The current allocation site area is wrong and removing further land exacerbates the Council's calculation of employment land available. The northern paddock should be re-incorporated in R30 as it is sustainable, easily accessed and there is demand and on-going discussions for the development of the site.	Yes The northern paddock should be re-instated to Policy R30 making available 2.18 hectares for employment use rather than the proposed 1.33 hectares to demonstrate the plan has been positively prepared, is justified, effective and therefore sound.	No change Objection noted. This is not considered to be a soundness issue. No representations relating to this plot of land have been received at any prior stage of the plan development. This plot of land was previously in different ownership and was in unauthorised use as residential land, there was no realistic prospect of demonstrating deliverability in the plan period. Changes in circumstance at this stage of the plan preparation are too late to be considered. References made to incorrect hectarage (4.57ha) do not relate to the

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
					GNLP but to the adopted site allocation plan for Norwich and are not relevant to this process.

MM63 - Policy R31 – Heigham Water Treatment Works, Waterworks Road

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25443	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		wording suggested by the respondent being used. The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.

MM64 - Policy R36 – Mile Cross Depot

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25444	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the	Yes We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state: “This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.	followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.	Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used. The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.

MM65 - Policy R37 – The Norwich Community Hospital Site, Bowthorpe Road

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline	25445	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to	Yes We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Jeffery) [20209]			make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.	<i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i>	is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used. The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.

Urban Fringe

MM70 – Policy COL1/GNLP0331BR & GNLP0331CR – Land adjacent to Norwich Research Park (NRP), Colney

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25431	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25334	Support	Historic England welcomes reference to the HER. Historic England welcomes criterion 15 and 18 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25371	Object	Comment made in covering letter: Archaeology Criterion In a number of policies in the Local Plan, there have been amendments made to a policy criterion relating to archaeology.	Yes Whilst this is an improvement on the previous wording, we suggest that the policy would be even better if it read:	Potential Change As discussed in the hearings for matter 13 (1hr 5 minutes onward) The Inspector required consultation of the Historic Environment Record to be removed from policy (<i>suggesting that it can be in</i>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>The criterion previously read Historic Environment Record to be consulted to determine any need for archaeological surveys prior to development and now reads, An archaeological assessment will be required prior to development.</p>	<p>‘Planning applications should be supported by a desk based archaeological assessment and, where necessary, the results of a field evaluation as advised by the LPAs archaeological advisors.’</p> <p>This is in accordance with para 194 of NPPF.</p>	<p><i>supporting text</i>). It was advised that the policy wording regarding archaeology needs to be strengthened (<i>no specific wording was discussed or agreed at that time</i>).</p> <p>The partnership has suggested a form of wording to address this matter consistently through relevant site allocation policies. The wording suggested here by Historic England was not previously suggested through the consultation or examination process.</p> <p>However, the partnership has no objection to the wording of the proposed modification being replaced with the wording put forward here by Historic England if this is considered to be a more appropriate form of words.</p>

MM71 – Policy COL2/GNLP0401C – Land rear/east of Institute of Food Research (IFR), Colney

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25446	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25335	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 1 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM72 – Policy GNLP0253 – Colney Hall, Watton Road, Colney

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25458	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the	Yes We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state: <i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore</i>	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.	<i>investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i>	Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used. The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning	25336	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2, 3 and 8 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure	No	No Change Support noted.

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Adviser) [19652]			consistency with national policy.		

MM74 – Policy COL3/GNLPSL2008 – Longwater Employment Area, Costessey

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25465	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are within a waste management site consultation area the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“The site is within the consultation area for a safeguarded waste management facility; therefore, the development must not prevent or prejudice the use of the existing waste management facility unless suitable alternative provision is made, or the facility is demonstrated to be no longer required”.</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.	(This wording also applies to AYL3 and AYL4 but there are no main modifications proposed for these sites.	The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.

MM76 – Paragraphs 3.20 and 3.21

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Wain Estates (Mr Nicholas Mills, Strategic Planning Manager) [20729]	25492	Object	Object to deletion of Costessey Contingency Site Assume that the Inspectors are in agreement that the principle of the contingency site is consistent with national policy 2 but that the issue, as raised in the Inspectors' letter, is that the trigger mechanism is not deemed to be effective and nor could it be reasonably be made	Yes Allocate GNLP0581/2043, or reinstate it as a contingency site	No Change Objection noted. The housing forecast trajectory and deliverability was extensively discussed through the examination. The Inspectors have considered points raised and have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented. The housing forecast has been informed by evidence

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>effective by modification. Respectfully disagree with this position and contend that the site is required and that the trigger mechanism could be made sound – reference back to previous submission statements.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty of housing trajectory (primarily relating to Nutrient Neutrality mitigation impacts), it is critical that additional sites for housing are identified. We strongly object to the omission of the Costessey contingency site on the basis that the flexibility it affords is imperative to the effectiveness of the Local Plan. Omission of this site also fails to facilitate expanded education growth in the area.</p>		<p>provided by site promoters and developers; it has taken a cautious approach to delivery to accommodate the likely impacts of the issues raised. The GNLP will have a five-year land supply upon adoption and a buffer to meet housing need in the plan period.</p> <p>Additional site allocations are not required to meet this need.</p>

MM78 – Policy GNL0307/GNL0327 – Land north of the A11, Cringleford

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
<p>Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]</p>	<p>25432</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25337	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 6 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.
Pegasus Planning Group (Mr Ed Durrant, Principal Planner) [19673] on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes [15660]	25429	Comment	It is recommended that the wording of the policy be amended to allow the extent of development and the overall numbers within the allocation to be subject to a design led approach. It would also be necessary to amend the wording on the Policy Map with reference to the uplift of homes being within the settlement boundary only. Whilst any development proposals	Yes Amend policy wording to allow the extent of development and the overall numbers within the allocation to be subject to a design led approach. Amend the wording on the Policy Map with reference to the uplift of homes being within the settlement boundary only	Potential Change This site was considered in detail at the hearing sessions and discussion included housing numbers, the use of the word approximately, the landscape buffer to the bypass protection zone, the wording on the Policy map and amendment to the policy criteria requiring connections to adjacent sites. The Inspectors have

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>would respect the settlement boundary, this could be a constraint to delivering the most appropriate development proposal for the edge of Cringleford.</p> <p>If no further amendments to the draft policy are made, then there should be great flexibility in the interpretation of 'approximately' when it comes to determining any applications for land within the allocation.</p> <p>It is recommended that the wording of the Policy Map be amended to include 'approximately' and remove reference to the new homes being within the settlement boundary.</p>	<p>For clarity amend policy criterion 2, bullet point 2 to read:</p> <p><i>"Connections to adjacent sites which support active travel and, where feasible, by all modes"</i></p>	<p>proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not consider that any significant changes are necessary. With regard to the respondent's suggestion for rewording the policy requirement related to connections to adjacent sites, the Partnership would have no objection to this if the Inspectors consider that the suggested wording provides greater clarity.</p>

MM79 – Policy KES2/GNLP0497 – Land west of Ipswich Road, Keswick

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
<p>Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]</p>	<p>25447</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Keswick & Intwood Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [12506]	25390	Comment	Keswick has experienced severe flooding, in main due to the Osted development which has created extensive flooding along the B1113, which is now being treated as a flood investigation site. The Parish Council is concerned about the provisions for drainage around the area and fears that the Keswick Industrial Estate (yet to be built) will exacerbate the issue.	Yes The Parish Council would like the issue of flooding and drainage to be considered extensively in regard to the GNLP.	No Change Comments noted. A new criterion relating to flood risk and drainage has been added to Policy 2. No further change is suggested by the Partnership.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack,	25338	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion	No	No Change Support noted.

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]			7 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.		

MM80 – Policy DRA1 – Land east of Cator Road and north of Hall Lane, Drayton

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25459	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider	Yes We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state: <i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i>	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.	(In the case of this policy the Pre Submission GNLP document did not include a safeguarding requirement so it should be added to the policy).	wording suggested by the respondent being used. The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25339	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 6 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM81 – Policy EAS1 – Land south and east of Easton

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
<p>Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]</p>	<p>25433</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.

MM82 – Policy HEL1 – Land at Hospital Grounds, southwest of Drayton Road, Hellesdon

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25448	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this	Yes We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state: <i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral</i>	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.	<i>resource does not take place</i> ".	wording suggested by the respondent being used. The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25340	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 4 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM83 – Policy HEL2 – Land at the Royal Norwich Golf Club, either side of Drayton High Road, Hellesdon

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25434	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.

MM84 – Policy HEL4/GNLP1019 – Land northeast of Reepham Road, Hellesdon

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Mrs Faye LeBon [20702]	25277	Object	<p>Strong objection to the proposal to remove policy HEL4.</p> <p>Deliverability was detailed in the Statement of Common Ground and remains achievable.</p> <p>Removal makes the plan unsound by being in contravention of social objectives to achieve sustainable development to meet the current and future</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Reinstate site allocation HEL4</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>This site was discussed in detail at the hearing sessions and the Inspectors heard evidence from both the landowner and the local authority. Their conclusion was that the site is not available and is unlikely to be available during the plan period therefore the allocation is not justified and should be deleted to ensure that the plan is sound. No change to this approach is suggested by the Partnership.</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>wellbeing needs of the residents of Hellesdon.</p> <p>Contravention of para 93 (a) of the NPPF.</p> <p>Setting of a precedent of undermining the importance of open space in the plan area</p>		

MM85 – Policy GNLP0172 – Land to the west of Green Lane West, Rackheath

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25449	Object	<p>Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.</p>	<p><i>to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.</p>

MM87 – Policy GNL0132 – Land off Blue Boar Lane/Salhouse Road, White House Farm, Sprowston

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
<p>Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]</p>	<p>25435</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Rackheath Parish Council (Parish Clerk, Clerk) [12989]	25293	Comment	Concern with additional wording <i>'the secondary school site will be safeguarded from development until 1 April 2026 or such time as a planning application including land for the secondary school at Rackheath on GT16 is approved and land for the secondary school is secured through a planning obligation, or such time as a formal notification is received from the Local Education Authority that the secondary school is not</i>	Yes We request that this additional language be removed in the GNLP. We suggest that recent events have impacted the timescale for GT16 to make progress and that the 1 April 2026 deadline for releasing the land earmarked for the school on GNLP0132 is premature.	No Change Comments noted. This issue was discussed through the examination and the Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented.

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p><i>required, whichever is sooner</i>".</p> <p>The timescale for this condition might have been reasonable in February 2022, at the time the Statement of Common Ground was signed. However, time has moved on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The developers had allowed the option on the land comprising GNLP0132 to lapse. - Nutrient Neutrality has lead to a significant delay in the timetable for GT16 which, at the date of writing, has still to deliver a revised masterplan. <p>Concerns that the express reference to a deadline of 1 April 2026 for the release of the land on GNLP0132</p>		

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>earmarked for the school in the GNLP is unhelpful.</p> <p>Additional concerns raised regarding site GT16 (not a GNLP allocation) catchment suitability for the school.</p>		
Ms Clare Howe (Sport England) [20709]	25388	Support	<p>Community access to the sports pitches at the secondary school is supported because it will assist in meeting the needs of the community as well as the school.</p> <p>Additional wording, specifically that <u>'the land uses shall comprise 12ha of land for a secondary school with sports pitches to be made available for community use.'</u> is supported.</p>	No	<p>No Change</p> <p>Support Noted</p>
Sprowston Town Council	25427	Object	Sprowston Town Council is opposed to	Yes	Potential Change

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
<p>(Mr G Ranaweera, Clerk) [13146]</p>			<p>the replacement of the existing positive requirement for “a new high school” within GNLP0132 with the option to provide land for a high school “if required”. The Town Council believes removal of the requirement to provide a new high school in Sprowston is unsound. Existing school provision is oversubscribed and increased levels of development in the area is adding to the issue, including highways related issues. Site GNLP0132 could provide a high school within walking distance to numerous new developments. Setting any expiry date by which planning permission for a high school on GT16 must be</p>	<p>1. The proposed modification sub-titled “Should land for a secondary school not be required the land uses shall comprise” should be amended as follows: amend the third (last) bullet point to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Formal and informal open space, including sports pitches, <u>children’s play space</u>, in accordance with the policies of the adopted development plan”. add a further bullet point/requirement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A suitable community building</u> <p>2. In the proposed modification sub-titled “The Requirement for a Secondary School”; remove “1 April 2026 or”.</p> <p>3. Irrespective of whether a high school is eventually provided in GNLP0132, or</p>	<p>Regarding point 1:</p> <p>Objection noted.</p> <p>This issue was discussed through the examination and the Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented.</p> <p>However, if the Inspectors are minded to include the update as suggested here, the partnership does not object.</p> <p>Regarding point 2:</p> <p>Objection noted.</p> <p>This issue was discussed through the examination and the Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>or secured, or by which the LEA must formally decide that a secondary school in GNLP0132 is not required, runs the very real risk that the area will lose out on a new high school simply by default.</p> <p>The potential loss of a school on this site also has negative impacts upon the form that the community space and sports facilities could take.</p> <p>The Parish Council is disappointed that the site allocation does not include firm requirements for key infrastructure (medical centre, dentist surgery, local shops etc.)</p>	<p>Rackheath GT16; Sprowston Town Council strongly believes a foot and cycle bridge (and ideally a motor vehicle flyover) must be built over the A1270 Northern Broadway and linked to the A1151 Wroxham Road to provide a safe means of crossing. Accordingly, Sprowston Town Council asks that a requirement is added to the modification to ensure any new high school in GT16 or GNLP0132 is supported by provision of suitable crossings over the A1270. Building a new high school without the necessary transport infrastructure would be unsustainable and unsound.</p>	<p>based on the evidence presented.</p> <p>Regarding point 3: The partnership does not support the proposed modification and notes that site GT16 is not an allocation in the GNLP and that site GNLP0132 is not adjacent to the A1270 so could not facilitate development of such a bridge as the required land is not part of this site.</p>

MM88 – Policy GNL0337R – Land between Fir Covert Road and Reepham Road, Taverham

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
<p>Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]</p>	<p>25436</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.

MM89 – Policy GNLP0159R – Land off Beech Avenue, Taverham

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25450	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this	Yes We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state: <i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral</i>	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.	<i>resource does not take place”.</i>	wording suggested by the respondent being used. The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.

MM90 – Policy TROW1 – Land on White Horse Lane and to the rear of Charolais Close & Devon Way, Trowse

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25451	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to	Yes We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.</p>	<p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.</p>

Main Towns

MM92– Policy GNLP0596R – Land at Norwich Road, Aylsham

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25463	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p> <p>(In the case of this policy the Pre Submission GNLP document did not include a safeguarding requirement</p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.	so it should be added to the policy).	supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Cornerstone Planning Ltd (Mr Alan Presslee, Director) [13498]	25375	Object	Our concern is the apparent ambiguity/confusion about allocation housing numbers. The title says: “the site is to accommodate approximately 255 homes.....to include a 90-bed care home”. The footnote (proposed to be moved to explanatory text) says: “The overall housing number for GNLP0596R is estimated at 300”. The current planning application proposes the erection of 255	Yes Our view is that the (various) policy and associated wording is confusing/lacks clarity, and thus unsound. The policy needs to provide clarity and certainty; we recommend that it should clarify that the site is to be allocated for a minimum of 255 dwellings plus an approximate 90-unit extra care home/independent living scheme.	Potential Change The total allocation of approximately 550 homes in Aylsham was considered through the examination process. It is now not thought necessary to include a footnote that explains how a 90 bed care unit/extra care housing scheme is being treated as equivalent to 45 dwellings. However, the Partnership has no objection if the inspectors would like to specify a wording that clarifies the 90 bed care

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>dwelling plus a 90-unit extra care home/independent living scheme (at an appropriate density of 27 dph).</p>		<p>unit/extra care housing scheme is additional to the 255 homes.</p>
<p>Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]</p>	25341	Object	<p>Whilst we broadly welcome the proposed modifications to criterion 8, we suggest the policy should also set out the mitigation measures identified in the heritage statement and set out in our SOCG2 (p61).</p> <p>At the end of criterion 8 we recommend adding: <i>“Mitigation measures should have regard to the recommendations of the Heritage Statement (June 2021) and include careful design and layout, an area of open space to the west of Diggens Farmhouse</i></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>At the end of criterion 8 we recommend adding: <i>“Mitigation measures should have regard to the recommendations of the Heritage Statement (June 2021) and include careful design and layout, an area of open space to the west of Diggens Farmhouse and enhanced tree and hedgerow planting”.</i></p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>Through the process of the hearings as part of the examination in public; this issue was not required as a main modification for soundness of the site allocation policy. Whilst Historic England may consider this a preferable form of wording, the partnership does not consider this to be a soundness issue.</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<i>and enhanced tree and hedgerow planting”.</i>		

MM93 – Policy GNLP0102 – Land at Frontier Agriculture Ltd, Sandy Lane, Diss

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25342	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 4 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM94 – Policy GNLP2108 – Land South of Spirketts Lane, Harleston

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25343	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 7 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM98 – Policy HAR7 – Land south of Spirketts Lane, Harleston

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25344	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 7 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM99 – Policy GNLP2109 – South of Hethel Industrial Estate, Bracon Ash

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25345	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 4 and 7 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM100– Policy HETHEL2 – Land South and South West of Lotus Cars, Hethel

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25466	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply	Yes We consider that for sites that are within a waste management site consultation area the policy wording should state: <i>“The site is within the consultation area for a safeguarded waste management facility; therefore, the development must not prevent or prejudice the use of the</i>	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.</p>	<p><i>existing waste management facility unless suitable alternative provision is made, or the facility is demonstrated to no longer be required”.</i></p> <p>(This wording also applies to AYL3 and AYL4 but there are no main modifications proposed for these sites).</p>	<p>Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.</p>
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25346	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 6 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25347	Object	In our SOCG2 (p65) we also advised that reference should be made in the policy to the grade II listed Little Potash/Brunel House.	Yes Reference should be made in the policy to the grade II listed Little Potash/Brunel House.	No Change Through the process of the hearings as part of the examination in public; this issue was not required as a main modification for soundness of the site allocation policy. Whilst Historic England may consider this a preferable form of wording, the partnership does not consider this to be a soundness issue.

Key Service Centres

MM103– Policy GNLP0378R/GNLP2139R – Land west of Acle (north of Norwich Road, south of South Walsham Road), Acle

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Savills [12969] on behalf of Hugh Crane [19634]	25300	Support	Hugh Crane are the landowner of a major part of the proposed allocation to the west of Acle and support the proposed Main Modifications to Policy GNLP0378R/GNLP2139R. They are committed to meeting the policy requirements and delivering the site within the plan period.	No	No Change Support noted
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25460	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it	Yes We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state: <i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral</i>	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.	<i>resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i> (In the case of this policy the Pre Submission GNLP document did not include a safeguarding requirement so it should be added to the policy).	Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used. The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy	25523	Comment	You mention the setting of the Broads, which is welcomed, but please add reference to protecting the dark skies of the Broads.	Yes Add reference to protecting the dark skies of the Broads.	No Change The inspectors considered this issue during the examination hearing sessions, concluding that it was not a matter of

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Officer) [12415]					soundness and that it was a matter for the Partnership to decide upon as an additional modification if they chose.

MM107 – Policy BLO1 – Land to the south of A47 and north of Yarmouth Road, Blofield

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25348	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM109 – Policy BRU3 – Land east of the Memorial Hall, Brundall

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Chris Smith Hopkins Home [14202]	25384	Comment	Hopkins Homes, as landowner, acknowledge that the grant of planning permission for a more comprehensive development of a larger	Yes Reword policy BRU3 to read: <i>“Land East of the Memorial Hall is allocated to provide</i>	No Change Comments noted. The deletion of this policy was discussed at the examination. There was no discussion of rewording the

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			site means that the policy as previously proposed is no longer appropriate. Rather than delete the policy it would be more prudent to amend the policy and area to reflect the more comprehensive development.	<i>a residential development of approximately 170 dwellings, together with a new Village Green of approximately 3ha and a new Country Park of approximately 7ha</i> With associated amendments to paragraph 5.25	policy to reflect the current permission for residential development and therefore no change is suggested by the Partnership.

MM110 – Policy HET1/Part of GNLP0177A – Land north of Hethersett

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25437	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to	Yes We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state: <i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially</i>	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.	<i>followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i>	representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used. The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25349	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 19 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM111 – Policy HET2 – Land north of Grove Road, Hethersett

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
<p>Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]</p>	<p>25452</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.

MM113 – Policy GNLP0520 – Land south of Norwich Road, Hingham

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Mrs A Doe Hingham Town Council [12974]	25386	Comment	The removal of the sentence <i>“More homes may be accommodated, subject to an acceptable design and layout being achieved, and any infrastructure issues addressed”</i> is supported.	No	No Change Support noted
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning)	25350	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 9 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and	No	No Change Support noted.

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Adviser) [19652]			ensures consistency with the national policy.		

MM114 – Policy HIN2 – Land adjacent to Hingham Industrial Estate at Ironside Way, Hingham

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25351	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 3 and 4 as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensure consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM115 – Policy GNLP0312 – Land to the east of Beccles Road, Loddon

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25461	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to	Yes We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state: <i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral</i>	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.</p>	<p><i>resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p> <p>(In the case of this policy the Pre Submission GNLP document did not include a safeguarding requirement so it should be added to the policy).</p>	<p>Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.</p>
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack,	25352	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion	No	No Change Support noted.

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]			3 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.		
Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]	25524	Comment	You mention the setting of the Broads, which is welcomed, but please add reference to protecting the dark skies of the Broads.	Yes Add reference to protecting the dark skies of the Broads.	No Change The inspectors considered this issue during the examination hearing sessions, concluding that it was not a matter of soundness and that it was a matter for the Partnership to decide upon as an additional modification if they chose.

MM116 – Policy GNLP0463R – Land off Langley Road, Chedgrave

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline	25462	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the	Yes We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Jeffery) [20209]			<p>NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.</p>	<p>resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p> <p>(In the case of this policy the Pre Submission GNLP document did not include a safeguarding requirement so it should be added to the policy).</p>	<p>for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25353	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM117 – Policy LOD3 – Land adjacent to Loddon Industrial Estate, Little Money Road, Loddon

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25354	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 5 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM118 – Policy POR3 – Ex MOD site, Pine Loke, Poringland

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
<p>Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]</p>	<p>25453</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25355	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 6 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM119 – Policy REP1 – Land off Broomhill Lane, Reepham

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Helen Lindsay [14942]	25291	Object	The entire point of this development's added benefit was to facilitate a sports hall for the school. The Inspector's review, assessed the school hall as vital. Its deletion makes the	No	No Change There was detailed discussion regarding this site at the hearing sessions which included removal of the sports hall, which is now to be provided on an

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNL Partnership response
			<p>whole proposal unjustified and unsound.</p> <p>I am the owner of the CWS and I suggest whoever undertakes the ecological appraisal contacts me for actual information on the site as I have never been asked how the proposed development might affect drainage, buffering and habitats.</p>		<p>alternative site outside the allocation boundary. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.</p> <p>The comment regarding ownership of the CWS is noted.</p>
Reepham Town Council (Town Clerk) [12490]	25297	Object	Major inconsistency between the GNL Partnership and the actual situation in Reepham which calls the soundness of the plan into question. The data and information used is based on outdated allocations from 2018 and has not taken into account or referred to up to date permissions. This is unlikely to be an isolated case and brings the soundness of the	No	<p>No Change</p> <p>There was detailed discussion regarding this site at the hearing sessions which included the housing number in the policy versus the number of homes in the planning application. The housing trajectory uses the figure in the planning application although the Inspectors have not instructed the Partnership to amend the number of homes in the policy. The Inspectors</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			GNLP as a whole into question.		have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any changes based on these representations.
Hugh Ivins [14963]	25374	Object	The primary concern in respect of this modification is NOT with regard to the text amendments but the requirement for the REP1 allocation to be REDUCED in size to reflect the amended text to ensure it is sound and legally compliant	No	No Change There was detailed discussion regarding this site at the hearing sessions which included whether the boundary of the allocation should be amended to reflect the removal of the sports hall and the number of houses in the policy versus the number of houses in the planning application. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any changes based on these representations.
Richard Taylor	25376	Comment	The modification to REP1 seems to contradict application	No	No Change

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/ Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
[19828]			(20200847) for 141 houses. Vagueness about developer's contribution of £1.5m to sports hall and whether the policy of 33% affordables creates uncertainty. Overall allocation of 203 homes for Reepham has not been explained or justified in the modifications. This results in an exploitable and concerning vagueness. How is this sound?		There was detailed discussion regarding this site at the hearing sessions which included the housing number in the policy versus the number of homes in the planning application. The housing trajectory uses the figure in the planning application although the Inspectors have not instructed the Partnership to amend the number of homes in the policy. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any changes based on these representations.
Norman Smith [20711]	25377	Comment	REP1 accommodates approximately 100 homes, Broadland Plan allocated maximum of approximately 120 homes. 141 homes planning application 20200847 should be	No	No Change There was detailed discussion regarding this site at the hearing sessions which included the housing number in the policy versus the number of homes in the planning application. The

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>amended to the lower GNLP figure.</p> <p>Highways should reduce highway to 8.0 metres. This permits a shared cycle/footpath of 3.0 metres and 5.0 metre carriageway. This reduction reflects the figure of 100 homes, omission of Sports Hall and lessens the dominance of vehicles in this rural area.</p>		<p>housing trajectory uses the figure in the planning application although the Inspectors have not instructed the Partnership to amend the number of homes in the policy. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any changes based on these representations.</p>
<p>Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]</p>	<p>25454</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.</p>	<p><i>sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.</p>

Broadland Village Clusters

MM124 – Policy GNLP0293 and CAW2 – Land east of Gayford Road, Cawston

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25455	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.

MM127 – Policy GNLP2019 and COL1 – Land at Rectory Road, Coltishall

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Coltishall Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [14396]	25282	Object	Coltishall Parish Council's original objection to COL1 and GNLP2019 still stand. The modification fails to recognise that this site is not deemed suitable given the well documented public safety issues on the B1150.	No	No Change This site was discussed in some detail at the examination. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GMLP Partnership response
Coltishall Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [14396]	25418	Object	<p>This will add the sewage of 30 and then 25 dwellings to a system which has no available sewage treatment capacity according to Water Cycle Study.</p> <p>Sewage discharges into the River Bure at Belaugh have been published at 170 hours p.1. in 2021 and 2022.</p> <p>Therefore these policies are:</p> <p>Non-compliant with environmental directives</p> <p>Irresponsible in adding to BDC's documented lack of capacity at Belaugh WRC</p> <p>Irresponsible to the quality of life of householders in the village.</p>	No	<p>No Change</p> <p>This site was discussed in some detail at the examination. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.</p>

MM128– Policy COL2 – Land at Jordan’s Scrapyard, Coltishall

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNL Partnership response
Coltishall Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [14396]	25281	Object	Coltishall Parish Council’s original objection stands. The policy should also include a recommendation for a transport assessment, based on the location at this site and well documented concerns about public safety on the B1150.	No	No Change This site was discussed at the examination. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25356	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 4 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM129 – Policy GNLP0605 – Land west of Foundry Close, Foulsham

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Adrian Pohajdak [16384]	25279	Object	Aubrey Rix Close and Stringers Lane are too narrow with unraised pavements and restricted visibility. Leaving Foundry Close onto Station Road is also a difficult junction because of restricted visibility and additional traffic will make this junction more dangerous.	No	No Change This issue was discussed in some detail at the examination and the Inspectors heard concerns from local residents. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.
Simon Kempson [16323]	25280	Object	Object on grounds of very poor access. Since the recent Aubrey Rix Close development from Stringers Lane, the junction with Foundry Close has become very busy; a danger to children, pedestrians and cyclists. The proposed additional development will	No	No Change This issue was discussed in some detail at the examination and the Inspectors heard concerns from local residents. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			increase the health and safety issue but will also destroy the wildlife corridor backing onto Foundry Close		any further changes based on these representations.
Sharon Stilgoe [15688]	25394	Object	I strongly object	No	No Change This issue was discussed in some detail at the examination and the Inspectors heard concerns from local residents. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.
Richard Stilgoe [16179]	25395	Object	Access via Stringers Lane will cause further congestion/parking issues, it is not wide enough for two cars to pass. Also there is a proposed school carpark/drop off point in	No	No Change This issue was discussed in some detail at the examination and the Inspectors heard concerns from local residents. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GMLP Partnership response
			the lane. Cars have to mount pavement to pass which would be encouraged even more and is illegal. Hedgerow has been removed in expectation of permission. Foundry Close/Stringers Lane junction causes right of way issues as it is currently.		plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.
Katie Scarfe [19118]	25396	Object	There is already a great deal of traffic around the proposed entry area for this new site around Aubrey Rix Close. There is also a high level of biodiversity on the fields in this area which would be impacted with the development	No	No Change This issue was discussed in some detail at the examination and the Inspectors heard concerns from local residents. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GMLP Partnership response
Richard Lindley [19471]	25397	Object	Object primarily due to safety and access reasons at Stringers Lane. The road is an accident waiting to happen with it being narrow and cars parked both sides and on pavements. A further c.30 cars and building traffic using the Stringers Lane and Aubrey Rix given the lack of ample pavement and a sufficient junction. The plan also seeks to develop a green space used by wildlife and previously for agriculture and not enhance the conservation area close by.	No	This issue was discussed in some detail at the examination and the Inspectors heard concerns from local residents. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.
Dean Watts [20716]	25398	Object	We have loved living here, its peaceful we also have a reactive dog which having a field instead of more noises	No	No Change This issue was discussed in some detail at the examination and the Inspectors heard concerns

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GMLP Partnership response
			behind the house is beneficial, lovely view it really would be a shame to ruin that.		from local residents. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership does not suggest any further changes based on these representations.
Miss L Scarfe [20717]	25399	Object	I strongly object to the residential development	No	No Change This issue was discussed in some detail at the examination and the Inspectors heard concerns from local residents. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.
Tom Howe [20718]	25401	Object	Object based on suitability of the roads (Aubrey rix close &	No	No Change This issue was discussed in some detail at the examination and the

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			stringers lane) as access.		Inspectors heard concerns from local residents. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.
Jack Cullington [20719]	25402	Object	Due to safety and access through Aubrey rix and stringers lane	No	No Change This issue was discussed in some detail at the examination and the Inspectors heard concerns from local residents. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.
David Jenkinson [20720]	25409	Object	My objection to the plan GNLP0605 is made on the grounds of extremely poor access	No	No Change This issue was discussed in some detail at the examination and the

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GMLP Partnership response
			and clear lack of suitable consideration given to the same. Other development has already increased traffic at the planned access routes which are now being utilised very heavily and already beyond the safe capacity of the junction and adjoining roads. Poor provision for pedestrian and cyclist users means that one or more serious accidents will simply be a matter of time if the proposed additional development goes ahead,		Inspectors heard concerns from local residents. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.
Foulsham Parish Council [15066]	25529	Object	The Parish Council remains strongly opposed to the development of GMLP0605 for the following reasons:	No	No Change These issues were discussed in some detail at the examination and the Inspectors heard concerns from local residents. The Inspectors have proposed

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GMLP Partnership response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is outside the settlement boundary • The site contains protected hedgerows • Access is via a narrow single track road, unsuitable for increase in traffic • Additional traffic resulting from the proposed school car park has not been factored in 		modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25357	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 2 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM130– Policy FOU2 – Land at Old Railway Yard, Station Road, Foulsham

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Miss L Scarfe [20717]	25400	Object	I object due to safety and access through Aubrey Rix and Stringers Lane	No	No Change This issue was discussed in some detail at the examination and the Inspectors heard concerns from local residents. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any further changes based on these representations.
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25456	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another	Yes We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state: <i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction</i>	Potential Change The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.	<i>to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i>	Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used. The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25358	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 5 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM132 – Policy FRE1 – Land north of Palmer’s Lane, Freethorpe

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNL Partnership response
Freethorpe Parish Council [14266]	25275	Comment	Please note this development has been completed and is now named Observer Close	No	No Change Comments noted.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25359	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 4 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM133 – Policy GNL0608R – Land at Bridge Farm Field, St Faiths Close, Great Witchingham

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNL Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25360	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 3 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
<p>Maddox Planning (Mr Dylan Kerai, Senior Planner) [19893], on behalf of Serruys Property Co. Ltd (Mr Richard Cubitt, LP Contact) [12917]</p>	<p>25471</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities (78, The Framework). Lenwade is the main service centre of the Great Witchingham, Lenwade, Weston Longville, Attlebridge, Little Witchingham and Morton-on-the-Hill village cluster.</p> <p>To reiterate previous representations made at Regulation 19 stage: Currently, there is only one allocation for 20 new homes in Lenwade, which is not consistent with national policy where it states that planning policies should identify opportunities for</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>A new allocation GNLP0553 for housing, consistent with the attached masterplan, should be included in the plan within an extended settlement boundary. Please see below the proposed allocation policy.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>Comments noted. This is not considered to be a soundness issue.</p> <p>This is a representation relating to a site not selected for allocation, as such was not discussed through the examination.</p> <p>The GNLP will have a five year land supply upon adoption and a buffer to meet housing need in the plan period distributed in accordance with the spatial strategy.</p> <p>Additional site allocations are not required to meet this need.</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services (78, The Framework). The allocation of land at Weston Hall, Weston Longville (GNLP0553) would promote sustainable development in Lenwade by locating housing where it will enhance the vitality of local services. In addition, identifying Lenwade as a village for growth will support the communities of the other villages within the cluster. An allocation of up to 85 new homes is likely to unlock the local school's capacity issues.</p>		

MM135 – Policy GNLP0125R – Land to the west of West Lane, Horsham St Faith

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25361	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 3 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM136 – Policy HNF1 – Land east of Manor Road, Newton St Faith

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25362	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 5 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM137 – Policy HNF2/GNLP0466R – Land east of the A140 and north of Norwich International Airport, Horsham St Faith

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25438	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p><i>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</i></p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy or the alternative wording suggested by</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		<p>the respondent being used.</p> <p>The Partnership would also have no objection to replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.</p>

MM139 – Policy GNLP0380 – West of Blofield Road, Lingwood

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Lindsay Balls [18887]	25299	Object	Strongly object – new houses on this site will ruin the rural environment of our village and cause more traffic on an already dangerous narrow country road. We do not have the infrastructure in the village to support this, the school is already oversubscribed and we do not have a dentist or doctors which puts pressure on other villages services.	No	No Change This site was discussed at the examination. The Inspectors have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented and the Partnership do not suggest any changes based on this representation.

MM141 – Policy GNLP2143 – Land south of Le Neve Road, Marsham

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Carter Jonas [12669] on behalf of	25289	Support	It is considered that the land at Le Neve Road should not have been allocated in GNLP for heritage and landscape	No	No Change Support noted

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Noble Foods Ltd [19330]			reasons. The proposed change in Main Modification MM141 to delete the housing allocation at land south of Le Neve Road in Marsham (Policy GNLP2143) is supported.		
Carter Jonas [12669] on behalf of Noble Foods Ltd [19330]	25290	Comment	It is proposed in MM141 to delete the housing allocation at land south of Le Neve Road in Marsham (Policy GNLP2143) for heritage reasons, which is supported. It is considered that a replacement housing allocation should have been made because the Marsham Cluster could accommodate an additional 50 to 60 dwellings, but no allocations are proposed for the village to provide	Yes Allocation of site GNLP3035 to make up shortfall of homes in Marsham.	No Change The Inspectors made it clear at the hearing sessions that they would not be discussing objectors' sites. In deleting site GNLP2143 the Inspectors have given no indication to the Partnership that an alternate site should be allocated to make up the shortfall in numbers. The Partnership would not

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			for those dwellings. There is an obvious and suitable replacement housing allocation available in Marsham at land at Fengate Farm (Ref. GNLP3035), which is a vacant and derelict site located on the edge of the village.		suggest any change to this approach.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25363	Support	Historic England welcomes the deletion of this policy and site allocation due to impact on heritage assets.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM142 – Policy GNLP1001 – Land to east of Station Road, Reedham

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]	25525	Comment	You mention the setting of the Broads, which is welcomed, but please add reference to protecting the dark skies of the Broads.	Yes Add reference to protecting the dark skies of the Broads.	No Change The inspectors considered this issue during the examination hearing sessions, concluding that it was not a matter of soundness and that it was a matter for the Partnership to decide upon as an additional modification if they chose.

MM144 – Policy GNLP0188 – Land adjoining Norwich Road, Salhouse

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]	25528	Comment	There is potential impact on the conservation area.	Yes Should the conservation area be mentioned?	No Change The conservation area is approximately 150 metres to the north and there are several existing properties in between. The Partnership considers there is no need to mention the conservation area for GNLP0188.

South Norfolk Village Employment sites

MM148 – Policy BKE3 – Brooke Industrial Estate

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste (Caroline Jeffery) [20209]	25457	Object	Removing the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policies is unsound because it is not in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 212). We understand that this change was proposed to make the plan sound as it was considered that the current text was not a policy requirement and was simply signposting to another policy of the development plan. We disagree with this approach and consider that it should be an allocation policy requirement to ensure safeguarded mineral	<p>Yes</p> <p>We consider that for the sites that are underlain by safeguarded mineral resource the policy wording should state:</p> <p>“This site is underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource; therefore investigation and assessment of the mineral will be required, potentially followed by prior extraction to ensure that needless sterilisation of viable mineral resource does not take place”.</p>	<p>Potential Change</p> <p>The Inspectors proposed a modification to move the mineral safeguarding requirement from the site policy to the supporting text for soundness. No change is suggested by the Partnership although if the Inspectors feel a change in approach is needed in response to this representation then the Partnership would have no objection to the current wording being reinstated in the policy</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			resources are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this could be avoided. It is accepted that cross reference to Policy CS16 may not be appropriate and alternative wording is suggested.		or the alternative wording suggested by the respondent being used. The Partnership would also have no objection in replacing the current supporting text wording with that proposed by the respondent if the Inspectors were minded to do so.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25364	Support	Historic England welcomes the proposed modifications to criterion 3 as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

Costessey Contingency Site

MM149 – Policy GNLP0581/2043 - Costessey Contingency Site

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Stantec (Miss Anne Kenchington, Planner) [20727], on behalf of Wain Estates (Mr Nicholas Mills, Strategic Planning Manager) [20729]	25493	Object	<p>Object to deletion of Costessey Contingency Site</p> <p>Assume that the Inspectors are in agreement that the principle of the contingency site is consistent with national policy 2 but that the issue, as raised in the Inspectors' letter, is that the trigger mechanism is not deemed to be effective and nor could it be reasonably be made effective by modification.</p> <p>Respectfully disagree with this position and contend that the site is required and that the trigger mechanism could be made sound – reference back to</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Allocate GNLP0581/2043, or reinstate it as a contingency site</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The housing forecast trajectory and deliverability was extensively discussed through the examination. The Inspectors have considered points raised and have proposed modifications to ensure the plan is sound based on the evidence presented.</p> <p>The housing forecast has been informed by evidence provided by site promoters and developers; it has taken a cautious</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>previous submission statements.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty of housing trajectory (primarily relating to Nutrient Neutrality mitigation impacts), it is critical that additional sites for housing are identified. We strongly object to the omission of the Costessey contingency site on the basis that the flexibility it affords is imperative to the effectiveness of the Local Plan. Omission of this site also fails to facilitate expanded education growth in the area.</p>		<p>approach to delivery to accommodate the likely impacts of the issues raised. The GNLP will have a five-year land supply upon adoption and a buffer to meet housing need in the plan period.</p> <p>Additional site allocations are not required to meet this need.</p>

Gypsy and Traveller Sites

MM150 – Policy GNLP5004R – Land off Buxton Road, Eastgate, Cawston

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Mr Steve Lee [20721]	25410	Object	<p>The site will cause light and noise pollution in a quiet and non-street-lit area and is very close to a neighbouring property. In 2019, one residential dwelling was refused, and a following appeal denied. The site has not changed since then, and there is a lack of need for development in the area.</p> <p>There will be a negative impact on the environment, such as loss of habitat for nesting birds and bats, removal of hedgerows and a large established oak tree. There will be loss of privacy to an adjacent property, harm</p>	No	<p>No Change</p> <p>The constraints of the site have been assessed through the examination process and it is now proposed to reduce the allocation from 4 pitches to 2 pitches. Constraints to do with the environmental, highway, local character, flood risk, compatibility with neighbouring uses, and the site's planning history have all been considered. GNLP5004R remains one of the favoured sites available and proposed</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>to visual amenity, and harm to the rural character of the area.</p> <p>Highway access to the site is unsuitable and cannot be made. There is very limited visibility exiting onto the road. There is no safe footpath or safe access to public transport to reach amenities in Cawston. The site has a medium to high ground water vulnerability and the road floods quite badly.</p>		<p>modifications will ensure the policy is sound.</p>
Mr David Steward [20299]	25383	Object	<p>We wish to express our serious concern at the dismissal of road safety issues, particularly with reference to the absence of footpaths and pavements. The site is acknowledged to be "remote from local community, [and with] no walking route to catchment school."</p>	No	<p>No Change</p> <p>The constraints of the site have been assessed through the examination process and it is now proposed to reduce the allocation from 4 pitches to 2 pitches. Constraints to do with the environmental,</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>When I raised this at the inspector's hearing on 25 July 2023 and the representative of the Highway Authority said something to the effect that this was not regarded as an obstacle to progress in itself. If that is so, then in our view, it is difficult to see what would be regarded as a showstopper.</p> <p>The lack of walkways is not mitigated by the presence of any long stretches of banks or verges which can be used for walking because there are few of these, and it must also be viewed in the context of the dangers on the roads as we have described them. Nor is it resolved by reducing the number of pitches from four to two.</p>		<p>highway, local character, flood risk, compatibility with neighbouring uses, and the site's planning history have all been considered. GNLP5004R remains one of the favoured sites available and proposed modifications will ensure the policy is sound.</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25365	Support	Historic England welcomes para 8.3 and criterion 3 of the policy as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM151 – Policy GNLP5022 – The Oaks, Land off Reepham Road, Foulsham

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Mr Tom Beer [20168]	25272	Support	We support the allocation of site GNLP5022. The site is available and MH Planning will imminently be submitting a planning application for 5 additional pitches, 1 of those 5 retrospective. This amounts to a total of 7 Gypsy and Traveller pitches at The Oaks, including the two pitches authorised in 2014. The application will also seek to clarify and authorise some of the	Yes A highway safety assessment is not needed as a policy requirements and the reference should be removed.	No Change The support for the allocation is noted, but the Partnership disagrees with removing the requirement for submitting a highway safety assessment at the planning application. This issue was considered during the examination process and the proposed

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>unauthorised development on the site.</p> <p>The reference to a requirement for a highway safety assessment risks putting an unnecessary hurdle in the way of delivery. Reepham Road is lightly trafficked, and the sight lines at the site entrance in excess of standards in both directions. Against the context of para 111 NPPF, a highway safety assessment is not needed and the reference should be removed.</p> <p>We would suggest that the detailed, site specific policies for each of the proposed allocations provides disproportionately detailed policies for the Local Plan. The matters</p>		<p>modifications will ensure the policy is sound.</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/ Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			raised can be addressed through development management in the normal course of events, and all that is needed in the Local Plan is the allocation of the sites.		
Mr Dave Thomas [19770]	25278	Comment	<p>Comment on behalf of a resident within the parish - agreed to post as their Councillor:</p> <p>Taking into account the previous frustrations historically with this site, being included as it stands makes the planning process very confusing. Concerns over amendments to the site without any due process via the local authority has caused issues locally, any expansion should address this before being approved or considered in any form.</p>	No	<p>No Change</p> <p>The constraints of the site have been assessed through the examination process and it is now proposed to reduce the allocation from 4 pitches to 2 pitches. Constraints to do with the environmental, highway, local character, flood risk, compatibility with neighbouring uses, and the site's planning history have all been considered. GNLP5004R remains one of the favoured</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			Lastly, the drainage on the site is a worry for the surrounding area, in terms of general drainage and sewage and there has been disruption to utilities in the area previously.		sites available and proposed modifications will ensure the policy is sound.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25366	Support	Historic England welcomes criterion 4 and the reference to nearby listed buildings as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.
Foulsham Parish Council (Mike Smith) [15066]	25530	Object	Foulsham Parish Council Response to GNLP5022 (MM151) - proposal to expand the Oaks travellers site The Parish Council remains strongly opposed to the development of the	No	No Change The highway constraints of the site have been assessed through the examination process. Constraints to do with the highway access, proportionality of development,

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>Oaks Travellers site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site has already been illegally expanded and the occupants have shown no regard for the planning process - The parish already has a disproportionately large number of travellers pitches - The site is not suitable for further occupation. There have been concerns raised before about waste disposal and it is understood that permission was never sought not granted for the access onto Reepham Road. - The activities of the current occupants negatively impact neighbours of the site. 		<p>compatibility with neighbouring uses, and the site's planning history have all been considered. GNLP5022 remains one of the favoured sites available and proposed modifications will ensure the policy is sound.</p>

MM154 – Policy GNLP5020 – Romany Meadow, The Turnpike, Carleton Rode

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Carleton Rode Parish Council (Mrs Sue Bunn) [20273]	25414	Comment	<p>It is proposed to increase the number of pitches available at the following locations GNLP5020 Romany Meadow, currently 6 pitches increasing to 12 and GNLP5024 Ugate Street currently 2 pitches increasing to 6. A total of 10 new pitches in all is disproportionate to the size of the village and the services that Carleton Rode can provide.</p> <p>Concerns exist over the water run off on to neighbouring highway and land which is already a problem with the existing scale of the site. This would only get worse by doubling the hard standing.</p>	No	<p>No Change</p> <p>The constraints of the site have been assessed through the examination process, including the proportionality of development, the access, and flood risk. GNLP5020 remains one of the favoured sites available and proposed modifications will ensure the policy is sound.</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>The sites both sit outside the development boundary and shops, schools and public transport can only be accessed by vehicles. A development for 3 Self Build homes, in the vicinity, has been refused in part due to the lack of access to local amenities.</p> <p>Policy GNLP5020 suggests access through the existing entryway but there is another gateway. If this was utilised it would create 2 self-contained sites, and mean vehicles would be pulling out on to a stretch of road with a 60mph limit. The site is also exposed, noticeable in the landscape, and sited in an arable farming area.</p>		

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Carleton Rode Parish Council (Mrs Sue Bunn) [20273]	25416	Object	GNLP5020 (Romany Meadow) has never been fully occupied. In 2009 when the original application was submitted for Romany Meadows there was uproar in the Parish with many objections to the site. The original site was to be small (4 pitches), family occupied and operate a repair business for traditional Gypsy Caravans over the years and several planning applications later, the site now has 6 pitches and can be used by anyone from the Traveller Community, this concerns the Council. The current 6 pitches are not fully occupied, even though planning permissions allow non-family members to live there,	No	<p>No Change</p> <p>The owner of GNLP5020 promoted the site through the local plan process for Gypsy and Traveller sites, and through the examination the site's availability, suitability, and deliverability has been tested. GNLP5020 remains one of the favoured sites available and proposed modifications will ensure the policy is sound.</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			and this shows a lack of need in Carleton Rode.		
Dr Catherine Rowett [20708]	25372	Comment	<p>As County Councillor for this village, I am requesting that attention should be paid to concerns about the proportionality of this scheme for a very small rural community that is already hosting two sites.</p> <p>I am concerned that increasing the provision from 8 to 18 pitches in one small rural village seems out of proportion and is necessitated more by the lack of any alternative option and the failure of other schemes (for unedifying reasons) than by any proper strategic overview of where the provision should be, and how it should be distributed across the county. I would also like</p>	No	<p>No Change</p> <p>The constraints of the site have been assessed through the examination process, including the proportionality of development, the access, and flood risk. GNLP5020 remains one of the favoured sites available and proposed modifications will ensure the policy is sound.</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			the concerns expressed by the parish concerning land drainage (not for the site but for the land to which it will drain) and the access gates to be taken seriously and addressed.		
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25367	Support	Historic England welcomes criterion 4 and the reference to nearby listed buildings as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM155– Policy GNLP5024 – Upgate Street, Carleton Rode

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Carleton Rode Parish Council (Mrs Sue Bunn) [20273]	25415	Object	It is proposed to increase the number of pitches available at the following locations GNLP5020 Romany Meadow, currently 6 pitches increasing to 12 and GNLP5024 Upgate	No	No Change The constraints of the site have been assessed through the examination process, including the proportionality of

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>Street currently 2 pitches increasing to 6. A total of 10 new pitches in all is disproportionate to the size of the village and the services that Carleton Rode can provide.</p> <p>Concerns exist over the water run off on to neighbouring highway and land which is already a problem with the existing scale of the site. This would only get worse by doubling the hard standing.</p> <p>The sites both sit outside the development boundary and shops, schools and public transport can only be accessed by vehicles. A development for 3 Self Build homes, in the vicinity, has been refused in part due to</p>		<p>development, the access, and flood risk. GNLP5024 remains one of the favoured sites available and proposed modifications will ensure the policy is sound.</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>the lack of access to local amenities.</p> <p>GNLP5024 (Upgate Street) is sited on a sharp S bend where the road narrows making pulling in hazardous. The site is not served by a footway. The site is exposed, noticeable in the landscape, and sited in an arable farming area.</p>		
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]	25368	Support	Historic England welcomes para 8.21 and criterion 4 of the policy as they provide greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.	No	No Change Support noted.

MM157 – Policy GNLP5028A/B – Land at Strayground Lane, Wymondham

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
Norfolk County Council (Mr Richard Doleman, Principal Transport Planner) [20723]	25430	Object	<p>The Highway Authority has been consistent in objecting to the greenfield allocation at Strayground Lane, and objects to its inclusion.</p> <p>Both Wharton's Lane and Strayground Lane are narrow with limited opportunity to pass opposing vehicles. Some informal passing places are available where the verge has been overrun and at private accesses. The only formal passing place is immediately north of the existing Household Waste Recycling Centre. Those limited existing passing locations are not inter-visible; consequently, opposing vehicles may need to reverse along highway,</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Do not allocate the greenfield part of the site, GNLP5028-A.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>The highway constraints of the site have been assessed through the examination process, which also heard how current vehicle movements will be substantially reduced by the development of 12 Gypsy and Traveller pitches. GNLP5028 A/B remains one of the favoured sites available and proposed modifications will ensure the policy is sound.</p>

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>presenting a road safety concern.</p> <p>The junction of Wharton's Lane and Strayground Lane is a right-angle bend with significantly substandard forward-visibility. The severity of the bend is likely to result in long/towing vehicles having to utilise the whole carriageway at a location where visibility is constrained.</p> <p>The verges at Wharton's Lane and Strayground Lane are narrow and steep, they offer pedestrians only very limited refuge from passing vehicles. There is no prospect of creating a footway. Pedestrians going to and from the site would need to walk within the</p>		

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>carriageway in conflict with vehicles.</p> <p>At the junction of Wharton's Lane/B1172 London Road, a stop-line and sign are present. This arrangement may only be used with authorisation of the Secretary of State when it is not possible to secure/provide visibility to an acceptable standard.</p> <p>It should also be noted that Wharton's Lane passes through an area designated by the Environment Agency as Flood Zone 2/3, presenting the risk that the site could be cut-off by flooding.</p> <p>If the Household Waste Recycling Centre located at GNLP5028B</p>		

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>should cease to operate, the resultant reduction in traffic movements at Strayground Lane/Wharton's Lane would be viewed by the Highway Authority as a road safety benefit.</p> <p>Should a development application come forward at GNLP5028B with similar trips to the existing use, it might be challenging for the Highway Authority to resist regardless of the proposed allocation. Allocation of the greenfield site GNLP5028A introduces risk of increased traffic use of an unsuitable route. This is unacceptable, a reduction of trips at Strayground Lane/ Wharton's Lane that would accommodate</p>		

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>GNLP5028A cannot be assumed.</p> <p>The site promoter seeks to argue that visibility from Wharton's Road to B1172 London Road meets the requirements of Manual for Streets. The Highway Authority is of the view that the B1172 is a corridor of movement and as a road rather than a street, visibility must be provided in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). It does not appear possible to improve visibility at the junction to accord with DMRB because of a rail bridge parapet to the east of the junction, hence presence of the stop line and sign.</p> <p>The promoter suggests that the access route</p>		

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>could be improved with provision of two passing places. They would not result in a system of intervisible passing places covering the whole route.</p> <p>Accordingly, the proposed passing places would not be sufficient to ameliorate the Highway Authority concerns, it also is highly doubtful they could be constructed; one would require excavation of a high bank that supports boundary hedging & trees, the other would possibly need a retaining feature as the ground falls away from the rear of the proposed construction.</p> <p>In summary, the Highway Authority has considered the provided evidence and remains of</p>		

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>the view that Strayground Lane/ Wharton's Lane cannot be sufficiently improved to satisfactorily accommodate development at GNLP5028A. It is the view of the Highway Authority that it is not possible to make meaningful improvements to the junction Wharton's Lane with the B1172. Furthermore, the passing bay improvements suggested for Strayground Lane and Whartons Lane do not overcome the fundamental issues of a lack of footway or insufficient width. A development application at the site would be likely to attract a Highway Authority objection, in line with</p>		

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
			<p>NPPF Paragraph 111 on highway safety grounds.</p> <p>The Highway Authority objects to the proposed allocation reference GNLP5028A on grounds of unacceptable impact to highway safety and concludes that the proposed allocation is not sound as it will not be deliverable and therefore this policy will not be effective.</p> <p>These comments of objection have been agreed with and are supported by County Councillor Graham Plant – Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport, and County Councillor Robert Savage – Wymondham Division.</p>		
Historic England	25369	Support	Historic England welcomes criterion 4	No	No Change

Respondent	Rep ID	Support/Object/Comment	Summary of comments	Any change suggested by respondent?	GNLP Partnership response
(Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19652]			and the reference to nearby listed buildings as it provides greater protection for the historic environment and ensures consistency with the national policy.		Support noted.