

Matter C, 2a

Site Allocation: VC ALP1, West of Church Meadow, Alpington

**a) Has the site been allocated previously or is it a new allocation?**

VC ALP1 is a new allocation for the VCHAP.

**b) Does the site have planning permission and/or are there current applications under consideration?**

There are no applications currently linked to this site.

**c) What is the land currently used for, what is the ownership position and is the site currently being promoted by a developer? Are there any site occupiers/leaseholders who would be affected, if so how?**

Current land use: VC ALP1 is a greenfield site.

Ownership position: ownership is under Hibbett and Key, local developer.

Promotion by developer: the site is promoted on behalf of Hibbert and Key.

Impact on site occupiers/ leaseholders: none known.

**d) Is the site sustainably located in relation to village services and facilities? Where is the nearest (a) primary school (b) convenience shop (c) village hall (d) recreation ground (e) other key facilities? How accessible are these for walkers and cyclists, in the case of walkers for example by continuous footways?**

Yes, the site is sustainably located in relation to village services and facilities. The table below summarises the connectivity of the site to the identified services and facilities.

FACILITY	LOCATION	SETTLEMENT
Primary school	Wheel Road	Alpington
Local shop	Mill Road (inc Post Office) B1332	Bergh Apton (within cluster) Poringland (outside cluster)
Village hall	Church Road	Alpington
Recreation ground	Adj Church Meadow	Yelverton

## Cluster 2: Aplington, Yelverton and Bergh Apton

Other (bus stop)	Church Road	Alpington
Other (public house)	Wheel Road	Alpington

There are footpaths out of the site, on both sides of Church Meadow, which connect to a footpath along the western (Church Meadow) side of Church Road, and along Wheel Road to the school and pub.

**e) Would the landscape and other physical impacts of the housing allocation be acceptable? Would it be acceptable in relation to the character and appearance of the area? How does it relate to the existing built-up area of the settlement? Are there any other significant constraints?**

The site is visually well contained, but the protection and enhancement of the existing boundary hedgerows and trees surrounding the site will be required. Although the Grade I Listed, St Mary's Church is to the north-east of the site, the existing development at Church Meadow and the sports pavilion means there is no intervisibility with the site.

Assessments of the landscape and townscape impact are included within the following evidence base documents:

Site assessment ([B.1A](#))

Landscape Visual Appraisal ([B.5.1](#))

**f) Is the access and site acceptable in highway terms?**

Yes, although localised widening of Church Road, particularly in the vicinity of the Church Meadow junction, and an improved crossing point between Church Meadow and Alpington with Yelverton Village Hall, are sought through the allocation policy.

**g) Is the estimate of site capacity justified?**

The site capacity reflects the scale and density of the adjoining Church Meadow development, the need to protect residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings, as well as the need to address flood risk issues identified in the Stage 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Additional capacity could be achieved if this is demonstrated to be acceptable through a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, subject to the usual planning considerations.

Appendix 1 of the Topic Paper sets out the site density ([B.11.1](#)).

**h) Are the site-specific requirements for development of the site justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?**

Yes. The site-specific policy requirements are supported by the evidence base for the Plan and have been informed by discussions with key technical consultees (such as highways, lead local flood authority and heritage colleagues). The policy requirements are justified by the evidence, are consistent with national policy and the Council considers that they will be effective.

**i) Would development of the site be viable, including the delivery of policy compliant affordable housing?**

The Council has produced a Viability Appraisal as part of the evidence base for the Plan, (B.6.1), and considers that the site is viable, and will deliver a policy compliant quantum of affordable housing.

The 2024 and 2025 Delivery Statement documents are appended to this statement.

**j) Overall, is the site deliverable within the plan period? When is development likely to commence? Has the landowner/developer confirmed this?**

Yes, the site is deliverable within the Plan period. The site promoter updated the anticipated timescales for delivery of the site in their October 2025 Delivery Statement.

Anticipated planning application date: 2026/27.

Commencement of works on site expected: 2027/28.

**Delivery Statement: Supplementary/Amended Information**

*(October 2025)*

**SITE REFERENCE:**

VC ALP1

**SITE ADDRESS (as per the site allocation policy):**

West of Church Meadow, Aplington

**SUPPLEMENTARY/ AMENDED INFORMATION COMPLETED BY (and on behalf of):**

John Long DipTP MRTPI on behalf of Jamie Key (Hibbett and Key)

**DATE OF COMPLETION OF SUPPLEMENTARY/ AMENDED INFORMATION:**

9 October 2025

Please provide an update in the text box below to any of the original responses provided in response to Questions 1-4 of the 'Delivery Statement for South Norfolk Council Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan' for your site. You will need to refer to the original submission when completing this form and **clearly state which response is to be updated**. This information will be brought to the attention of the Inspector as part of the Examination process.

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary).

The majority of the information included in the VCALP1 Landowner's original response (4 October 2025) remains valid. The Landowner's situation and position have not changed and the land remains available for development.

The only change required is to Section 4 of the original response which set out a likely timetable for a planning application submission. This is now more likely to be in 2026/27 following adoption of the VCHAPS anticipated to be in 2026, with a start date likely to be late 2027/2028.

**or**

The information submitted in 2024 remains valid and unchanged

## **Delivery Statement for South Norfolk Council Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan**

**SITE REFERENCE:**

VC ALP1

**SITE ADDRESS (as per the site allocation policy):**

West of Church Meadow

**PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**

Approximately 25 dwellings on 1.87 ha

**DELIVERY STATEMENT COMPLETED BY (and on behalf of):**

Jamie Key (Hibbett and Key)

**DATE OF COMPLETION OF DELIVERY STATEMENT:**

4 October 2024

1. Please confirm whether the site meets the three tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and can therefore be considered to be available, suitable and deliverable taking into account the policy requirements of the GNLP and the VCHAP, as well as CIL payments, Biodiversity Net Gain, and where appropriate Nutrient Neutrality.

*(Approx. 100 words)*

The Landowner/developer considers that the site allocation/policy meets the three tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Landowner/developer confirms that the site remains 'available' for development. The Landowner/developer confirms that on the basis of current available information, the site remains 'suitable' for development. Also, taking into account the site's requirements including the off-site highways works; flood risk assessment and drainage strategy; measures to ensure the protection of veteran trees adjoining; measures to minimise the impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties; CIL; and BNG, the site remains 'deliverable'. Once allocated, the Landowner/developer will commission the necessary technical work to support a planning application and inform a development scheme, including highways, flood risk assessment; and arboricultural assessments etc. The highway works, to widen Church Road, formalising the Church Road bus stops and an improved crossing point can be delivered, provided that the land needed is within the adopted highway.

2. Please confirm the land ownership details of the site, including any discussions and/or agreements with developers if appropriate.

*(Approx. 100 words)*

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

Ownership is under Hibbett and Key (a local developer)

3. Please provide any details relating to progress made towards the submission of a planning application on the site if applicable (i.e., obtaining pre-application advice, technical surveys, engagement and/or agreements with statutory bodies, or the submission of a planning application).

*(Approx. 100 words)*

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

Pre application technical surveys completed including ecology and highways assessments.

4. Please provide a brief commentary on the site's delivery, for example an anticipated date for the submission of a planning application, a predicted start-on-site date and the likely completion date of the development.

*(Approx 100 words)*

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

Anticipated date of planning submission is 2025. Start site date in early 2026.

Matter C, 2b

Site Allocation: VC BAP1, Former Concrete Batching Plant, south of Church Road, Bergh Apton

**a) Has the site been allocated previously or is it a new allocation?**

VC BAP1 is a new allocation for the VCHAP.

**b) Does the site have planning permission and/or are there current applications under consideration?**

There are currently no applications linked to this site.

**c) What is the land currently used for, what is the ownership position and is the site currently being promoted by a developer? Are there any site occupiers/leaseholders who would be affected, if so how?**

Current land use: VC BAP1 is a brownfield site, having formerly been used as a concrete batching plant and now used for the storage of scrap material.

Ownership position: The site has two owners, but FW Properties is in full control of the site.

Promotion by developer: The two landowners have exchanged conditional contracts with FW Properties.

Impact on site occupiers/ leaseholders: As noted above, the current occupiers of the site have exchanged conditional contracts with the site promoter.

**d) Is the site sustainably located in relation to village services and facilities? Where is the nearest (a) primary school (b) convenience shop (c) village hall (d) recreation ground (e) other key facilities? How accessible are these for walkers and cyclists, in the case of walkers for example by continuous footways?**

Yes, the site is sustainably located in relation to village services and facilities. The table below summarises the connectivity of the site to the identified services and facilities.

FACILITY	LOCATION	SETTLEMENT
Primary school	Wheel Road	Aplington
Local shop	Mill Road (inc. Post Office)	Bergh Apton

## Cluster 2: Aplington, Yelverton and Bergh Apton

FACILITY	LOCATION	SETTLEMENT
Village hall	Cooke's Road	Bergh Apton
Recreation ground	Cooke's Road	Bergh Apton
Other (Post Office)	Mill Road	Bergh Apton
Other (Pub)	Wheel Road	Alpington

The site is slightly detached from the other dwellings in the settlement, and there are no pedestrian footways linking the site to local facilities; however, the County Council has recognised that the traffic generation from the redevelopment of the site is offset by the discontinuation of the current/historic uses.

**e) Would the landscape and other physical impacts of the housing allocation be acceptable? Would it be acceptable in relation to the character and appearance of the area? How does it relate to the existing built-up area of the settlement? Are there any other significant constraints?**

The site is currently detrimental to the local landscape and a well-designed scheme offers the opportunity to deliver a development which is appropriate within the local landscape type, enhancing views from Church Road and the nearby bridleway Bergh Apton BR15.

The existing planting is largely non-25 native, however the established trees on the eastern boundary should be retained and landscaping to the south and west will help visually contain the site within a wider rural landscape.

The site is slightly detached from the existing clusters of development in Bergh Apton, however the settlement is dispersed in character and has no strong village 'core'. The nearest cluster of dwellings, to the east on Church Road, includes a group of listed Tayler and Green dwellings, and any development will need to ensure the setting of those buildings is protected and enhanced.

Assessments of the landscape and townscape impact are included within the following evidence base documents:

Site assessment ([B.1A](#))

Landscape Visual Appraisal ([B.5.1](#))

**f) Is the access and site acceptable in highway terms?**

As noted above, the highway authority is satisfied that traffic generation from up to 25 dwellings is acceptable when offset by the current/previous uses of the site, particularly when taking into account the nature of the vehicles. This is subject to improvements to



Church Road between the allocation and The Street, to facilitate the safe passing of vehicles.

**g) Is the estimate of site capacity justified?**

The capacity of the site reflects its rural location, and the need to minimise the impact of traffic generation.

Appendix 1 of the Topic Paper sets out the site density (B.11.1).

**h) Are the site-specific requirements for development of the site justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?**

Yes. The site-specific policy requirements are supported by the evidence base for the Plan and have been informed by discussions with key technical consultees (such as highways and landscape). The policy requirements are justified by the evidence, are consistent with national policy and the Council considers that they will be effective.

**i) Would development of the site be viable, including the delivery of policy compliant affordable housing?**

The Council has produced a Viability Appraisal as part of the evidence base for the Plan, (B.6.1), and considers that the site is viable, and will deliver a policy compliant quantum of affordable housing.

It is acknowledged that this is a brownfield site, with potential remediation costs, and a limit on the capacity of the site, based on highways comments, physical size, and the rural location. However, the site is outside the area affected by nutrient neutrality, and therefore avoids the associated costs. The site promoter has also undertaken a pre-application with the Council, supported by various evidence studies, and is therefore aware of some of the likely costs associated with developing the site.

The 2024 and 2025 Delivery Statement documents are appended to this statement.

**j) Overall, is the site deliverable within the plan period? When is development likely to commence? Has the landowner/developer confirmed this?**

Yes, the site is deliverable within the Plan period. The site promoter updated the anticipated timescales for delivery of the site in their October 2025 Delivery Statement.

Anticipated planning application date: Submission in 2026 for determination after adoption of the VCHAP.

## Cluster 2: Aplington, Yelverton and Bergh Apton

Submission of reserved matters application expected:

Commencement of works on site expected: As soon as possible following the receipt of planning permission.

Completion expected: Site expected to be completed in a single phase.

Delivery Statement: Supplementary/Amended Information

9 October 2025

**SITE REFERENCE:**

VC BAP1

**SITE ADDRESS (as per the site allocation policy):**

Former concrete batching plant, South of Church Road, Bergh Apton

**SUPPLEMENTARY/ AMENDED INFORMATION COMPLETED BY (and on behalf of):**

Julian Wells of FW Properties (The Developer of the Site)

**DATE OF COMPLETION OF SUPPLEMENTARY/ AMENDED INFORMATION:**

9 October 2025

Please provide an update in the text box below to any of the original responses provided in response to Questions 1-4 of the 'Delivery Statement for South Norfolk Council Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan' for your site. You will need to refer to the original submission when completing this form and **clearly state which response is to be updated**. This information will be brought to the attention of the Inspector as part of the Examination process.

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary).

**Update to Original Response to Question 4** – FW Properties are intending to submit the detailed planning application for the development of 25 units on this site in 2026 so that it can be determined immediately after the adoption of the VCHAPS. FW Properties will commence the on-site construction works as soon as possible following the receipt of planning consent and will deliver all the new homes in one principal phase of development.

**or**

The information submitted in 2024 remains valid and unchanged

## **Delivery Statement for South Norfolk Council Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan**

### **SITE REFERENCE:**

VC BAP1

### **SITE ADDRESS (as per the site allocation policy):**

Former concrete batching plant, South of Church Road, Bergh Apton

### **PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**

Up to 25 dwellings on 1.65ha

### **DELIVERY STATEMENT COMPLETED BY (and on behalf of):**

Julian Wells of FW Properties (The Developer of the Site)

### **DATE OF COMPLETION OF DELIVERY STATEMENT:**

16 October 2024

1. Please confirm whether the site meets the three tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and can therefore be considered to be available, suitable and deliverable taking into account the policy requirements of the GNLP and the VCHAP, as well as CIL payments, Biodiversity Net Gain, and where appropriate Nutrient Neutrality.

*(Approx. 100 words)*

**FW Properties confirm that the Site is available, suitable and deliverable for the development of 25 new dwellings taking into account the policy requirements of the GNLP and the VCHAP, as well as CIL payments, and Biodiversity Net Gain. The Site is outside the area effected by Nutrients Neutrality. We also confirm that we can meet the Site Specific Requirements attached to the draft allocation for this brownfield site.**

2. Please confirm the land ownership details of the site, including any discussions and/or agreements with develops if appropriate.

*(Approx. 100 words)*

FW Properties have exchanged conditional contracts with the two owners of the Site so the Site is in full control of the Developer and available for development.

3. Please provide any details relating to progress made towards the submission of a planning application on the site if applicable (i.e., obtaining pre-application advice, technical surveys, engagement and/or agreements with statutory bodies, or the submission of a planning application).

*(Approx. 100 words)*

**FW Properties have carried out a pre-app with the planners and received a supportive response for our current development proposals for the Site. As part of the evolution of the scheme design, FW Properties have commissioned a number of the technical surveys including drainage investigations and demolition surveys which confirm that the development of this land can be delivered.**

4. Please provide a brief commentary on the site's delivery, for example an anticipated date for the submission of a planning application, a predicted start-on-site date and the likely completion date of the development.

*(Approx 100 words)*

**FW Properties are intending to submit the detailed planning application for the Site in 2025 so that it can be determined immediately after the adoption of the VCHAPS. FW Properties will commence the development works as soon as possible following receipt of planning consent and will deliver all of the new homes in one principle phase of development.**

Matter C, 2c and 2d

Settlement Limit: Alpington, Yelverton and Bergh Apton

**a) Are the settlement limits proposed suitable and justified given their policy function?**

Yes, the settlement limits for Aplington and Yelverton, and Bergh Apton are suitable and justified.

The settlement limit for Alpington and Yelverton is focused around the main built developments along Church Road and Wheel Road. The settlement limits for Bergh Apton are focused around the main built areas along Mill Road and Threadneedle Street, around the junction of Cookes Road and The Street and further south on The Street. The development north of Mill Road is within Aplington Parish, however it has been included within the settlement limit for Bergh Apton due to its proximity to the rest of the development.

A site south of Bergh Apton Road and west of Nichols Road, adjacent to the primary school, was submitted for consideration as part of the VCHAP. Following assessment of this site it has been incorporated into the settlement limit for Alpington.

The settlement limits will allow some limited future infill development to occur in the most sustainable locations in the cluster whilst preventing encroachment into the countryside.

**b) Where changes to settlement limits are proposed, are these:**

**(i) Justified by development on the ground? or**

**(ii) Where potentially allowing further development, that development would be in a suitable location relative to services and facilities, would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would not have any other adverse planning effect?**

The change to the Aplington and Yelverton settlement limit is considered to be suitable under part (ii). The site assessment for the settlement limit extension concluded that the site is adjacent to the existing settlement limit and is a reasonable distance from local services. It does not that any development would need to respect the existing linear development, likely with frontage development, and would require suitable landscaping but with these could be a suitable extension to the village.

Allocations and Settlement Limit Extensions Site Assessments ([B.1A](#))

**c) Should any other settlement limits be included in the plan to reflect other hamlets or existing areas of development in the cluster?**

No. There are no other hamlets or existing areas of development that are of a significant enough scale to justify a settlement limit.