

Matter C, 22a

Site Allocation: VC ELL1, South of Mill Road, Ellingham

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

VC ELL1 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 ELL1 is a greenfield site.

Ownership position: The site is in sole ownership.

Promotion by developer: Landowners are keen to engage with a developer as soon as they have certainty around the allocation.

Impact on site occupiers/ leaseholders: The land is currently vacant.

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.

Cluster 22: Kirby Cane & Ellingham

FACILITY	LOCATION	SETTLEMENT
Primary school	Church Road	Ellingham
Local shop (inc Post Office)	Mill Road	Ellingham/Kirby Cane
Village hall	Old Yarmouth Road	Kirby Cane
Recreation ground	Mill Road	Ellingham
Other (bus stops)	Mill Road	Ellingham
Other (bar/restaurant)	Old Yarmouth Road	Kirby Cane

There is a continuous footway on the opposite (northern) side of Mill Road leading to the primary school and (with a small gap in provision) to the facilities in the adjoining village of Kirby Cane (shop/post office, village hall, bus stops, and bar/restaurant). The recreation ground is immediately to the west of the site and Policy VC ELL1 requires direct footway provision between the two.

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 open to the wider landscape, including the Broads Authority area, the Grade I listed St Mary's Church, and Ellingham Conservation Area, to the south. Whilst the site could close the gap between the existing dwellings on Mill Road and the recreation ground (subject to the easement around the high pressure pipeline), the allocation has been designed to retain the connection across the fields, particularly to St Mary's Church, which is likely to become more prominent from Mill Road with the creation of visibility splays for the development.

Looking towards the site from the south, it will be seen in the context of the existing village. Notwithstanding this, Policy VC ELL1 requires a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) to be submitted alongside any planning application to ensure that the design, layout and landscaping of the site appropriately takes into account the River Valley landscape. Particular attention should be paid to views to/from the Broads Authority area, Ellingham Conservation Area and the listed church, as well as views from the surrounding footpath and highways network.

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?

Access to the site from Mill Road will need to be towards the western edge of the allocation, in order to achieve good visibility splays. Carriageway widening and footway provision will also be required, and the developers will need to work with the Highway Authority on the promotion of a Traffic Regulation Order to extend the current 30mph speed limit.

Whilst Norfolk County Council, as Highways Authority, has no objection to the principle of an allocation in this location, they maintain an objection to the extent of the allocation boundary, which the County Council considers should include the full width of the frontage from 81 Mill Road to the recreation ground, to incorporate the required visibility splays.

g) Is the estimate of site capacity justified?

Whilst the density of the site is relatively low, this reflects the need to integrate the site with the wider countryside, particularly as there are no defined field boundaries at the southern and western extents of the allocation. In particular, there are sensitivities relating to views to/from the south. The site wraps around existing dwellings on Mill Road, and a lower density allows for consideration to be given to the impact on the amenity of those dwellings.

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 the highways authority and the Broads Authority). 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.

As a relatively unconstrained greenfield site, outside of the area affected by Nutrient Neutrality, there are no anticipated exceptional costs associated with this allocation.

The 2024 Delivery Statement document is 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 2024 Delivery Statement.

Anticipated planning permission/ planning application date: This was originally anticipated to be during 2025, based on the site being allocated earlier this year (2025); however, the landowner is keen to engage a developer to submit a planning application as soon as there is certainty around the allocation.

Delivery Statement for South Norfolk Council Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

SITE REFERENCE:

VC ELL1

SITE ADDRESS (as per the site allocation policy):

South of Mill Road

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Approximately 25 dwellings on 1.63ha

DELIVERY STATEMENT COMPLETED BY (and on behalf of):

Richard Shuldhham MRICS on behalf of Vaughan Smith

DATE OF COMPLETION OF DELIVERY STATEMENT:

07.10.2024

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)

To the best of our knowledge the site is available, suitable and deliverable and is not impacted by Nutrient Neutrality.

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

(Approx. 100 words)

The site is in the sole ownership and control of our client

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)

The landowners are keen to engage a developer to submit a planning application as soon as they have certainty around the allocation.

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)

The target would be for the submission of a planning application in 2025 with delivery being as soon as possible thereafter.

Site Allocation: VC ELL2, Land at Florence Way, Ellingham

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

VC ELL2 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 ELL2 is a greenfield site.

Ownership position: Main site is owned by Bromley Homes Ltd.

Impact on site occupiers/ leaseholders: The site is currently vacant.

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	Church Road	Ellingham
Local shop	Mill Road	Ellingham/Kirby Cane
Village hall	Old Yarmouth Road	Kirby Cane
Recreation ground	Mill Road	Ellingham
Other (bus stop)	Mill Road	Ellingham
Other (bar/restaurant)	Old Yarmouth Road	Kirby Cane

There is a pathway which goes continuously down Mill Road on one side, and intermittently along the other side. Old Yarmouth Road has a footway on both sides.

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?

VC ELL2 is well contained within the landscape by existing development to the north, east and west. Views of the site from the countryside, including from Ellingham FP2/FP3, will be seen against the backdrop of existing built form on both Florence Way and Mill Lane and will not represent a significant intrusion into the countryside.

A modest area of open space and some immature landscaping forms part of the existing scheme at Florence Way, adjacent to the eastern boundary. Opportunities to integrate VC ELL2 with the existing properties and the soft landscaping at Florence Way should be explored as part of the site layout and design. However, the existing southern boundary of the site should be strengthened to provide some mitigation for the visual impact of the development from Ellingham FP3. For the same reason a suitable boundary will be required along the western boundary of the site. The need to reinforce existing planting to contain the site was identified as part of the Landscape Visual Appraisal and has been included within the policy.

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. VC ELL2 will be accessed via Florence Way, however this is currently an unadopted highway and will require upgrading to facilitate access to the new development. The Highways Authority have confirmed that a number of additional on- and off-site highways works will be required to ensure highway safety is maintained including:

- localised improvements to Florence Way;

Cluster 22: Kirby Cane & Ellingham

- improvements to Ellingham FP3;
- securing sufficient land to ensure appropriate visibility splays can be created at the Florence Way/Mill Lane junction;
- and localised carriageway widening to Mill Lane, north of Florence Way.

A significant tree is located at the junction of Florence Way and Ellingham FP3 and must be protected and retained as part of any highway improvement works.

g) Is the estimate of site capacity justified?

Yes. VC ELL2 is allocated for 12 dwellings on 0.52 hectares, resulting in a density of 23.53 dwellings per hectare. Considering the locations surrounded by existing development, this is considered appropriate and will reflect the density of existing development in the area.

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 Norfolk County Council). 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 Delivery Statement confirmed that the site is available and deliverable having regard for other policy requirements such as CIL and BNG. Pre-application advice was received in 2022.

The 2024 and 2025 Delivery Statements 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.

Anticipated planning application date: Q1 2026.

Completion expected: 2028/2029.

Delivery Statement: Supplementary/Amended Information

(October 2025)

SITE REFERENCE:

VC ELL2

SITE ADDRESS (as per the site allocation policy):

Land at Florence Way

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

Cornerstone Planning Ltd obo Bromley Homes Ltd

DATE OF COMPLETION OF SUPPLEMENTARY/ AMENDED INFORMATION:

17/10/2025

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 Delivery Statement of 04 October 2024 remains correct/relevant save for part 4.

It is anticipated that an application will be made in Q1 of 2026, with delivery of dwellings in 2028/2029.

or

The information submitted in 2024 remains valid and unchanged

A Presslee (Cornerstone Planning Ltd. 17.10.2025

Delivery Statement for South Norfolk Council Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

SITE REFERENCE:

VC ELL2

SITE ADDRESS (as per the site allocation policy):

Land at Florence Way

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

At least 12 dwellings on 0.51ha

DELIVERY STATEMENT COMPLETED BY (and on behalf of):

Cornerstone Planning Ltd obo Bromley Homes Ltd

DATE OF COMPLETION OF DELIVERY STATEMENT:

04 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 site is available, suitable, and deliverable, having regard to the requirements of the adopted GNLP and emerging VCHAP (draft policy VC ELL2). CIL and BNG requirements can be met. Nutrient Neutrality is not applicable

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

(Approx. 100 words)

The main site is owned by Bromley Homes Ltd, which intends to develop the site in accordance with VC ELL2. Agreement has been reached with South Norfolk Council re. use/adoption of Florence Way (access road). Agreement has been reached with the RSL for the provision of affordable homes.

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)

Pre-application advice (2022) received from South Norfolk Council, Norfolk County Highways, and LLFA. Majority of requisite consultants' work (for application) completed. Planning application to correspond with the requirements of the proposed Policy VC ELL2 and supporting text. See above re. agreements reached.

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)

Planning Application anticipated in 2025. Delivery of dwellings in 2027-2028

Settlement Limit: Kirby Cane and Ellingham

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

Yes, the settlement limit for Kirby Cane and Ellingham is suitable and justified. The settlement limit has been drawn to include the main built form of the settlement, excluding the separate developments at Yarmouth Road and Mill Pool Lane, and to limit future infill development to the most sustainable location in the cluster whilst preventing encroachment into the countryside.

There are no significant areas of existing development that are not included in the settlement limit.

The settlement limits do not meet any of the criteria outlined in the Topic Paper for extension/alteration, and therefore there are no proposed changes to the existing settlement boundaries.

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?**

No changes to the settlement limit are proposed as part of the VCHAP.

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.