

Matter C, 43a

Site Allocation: VC HAD1, Land south of Haddiscoe Manor Farm, Haddiscoe

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

VC HAD1 is a new allocation for the VCHAP.

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

The site does not have planning permission and there are no applications currently under consideration on 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 HAD1 is a greenfield site

Ownership position: The site is under sole ownership

Promotion by developer: The owners are currently in contract stages with a developer

Impact on site occupiers/ leaseholders: The site is 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	Yarmouth Road / A143	Toft Monks
Local shop	Beccles Road / Mill Lane	Thurlton / Thorpe-next-Haddiscoe
Village hall	The Street / A143	Haddiscoe
Recreation ground	The Street / A143	Haddiscoe
Other (bus stop)	The Street / A143	Haddiscoe

The Street / A143 has continuous footpaths connecting the site to the centre of the village. The site is also adjacent to the village hall. Whilst there is also a footpath connecting the site to the primary school in Toft Monks, this is of limited width in sections. There are no footpath connections to the local shop in Thurlton, or to Hillfield Nursery and Farm Shop due to the rural nature of the connecting road network.

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 HAD1 proposes an area to be allocated within a wider agricultural parcel, adjacent to the village hall and opposite existing residential development. Whilst the allocation boundaries extend from the road frontage, the policy requires an area of open space to be retained to the north of the site (along the site frontage). This open space is intended to have a number of different purposes including retaining key views across the frontage of the site towards the nearby listed church (St Mary's Church) and reduction of noise impact on the amenity of new residents. The A143 which runs parallel to the site frontage is a designated Corridor of Movement and this is reflected in the site-specific policy requirements relating to the design and layout of the site. The wider visual impacts resulting from this allocation will be limited due to the containment of the site in the landscape by existing established vegetation and trees. Trees along the site frontage are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and are required to be protected by the policy.

Assessments of the landscape and townscape impact, as well as the potential heritage impact of development, are included within the following evidence base documents:

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

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

Historic Impact Assessment ([B.4.1](#))

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

Yes. Access to the site must only be via the A143 unless otherwise agreed by the Highways Authority, as set out in the policy requirements for the site. Discussions with the Highways Authority highlighted the need for a right turn lane junction and a pedestrian crossing to be installed on the A143 and included in the site-specific policy requirements.

g) Is the estimate of site capacity justified?

Yes. The density/ capacity of the site reflects the identified constraints of the site, as well as the context of the site.

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 Historic England and the highways 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.

The site promoter confirmed the viability of the site in accordance with national and site-specific policy requirements in their 2024 Delivery Statement.

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: Expected within the next 18 months.

Submission of reserved matters application expected: 18 months after planning permission.

Commencement of works on site expected: 18 months after planning permission.

Delivery Statement: Supplementary/Amended Information

(October 2025)

SITE REFERENCE:

VC HAD1

SITE ADDRESS (as per the site allocation policy):

Land south of Haddiscoe Manor Farm, Haddiscoe

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

Brown & Co

DATE OF COMPLETION OF SUPPLEMENTARY/ AMENDED INFORMATION:

20/10/25

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).

In relation to Question 4, it is anticipated that a planning application would be forthcoming within 18 months and, depending upon outcome, reserved matters and start on site within 18 months thereafter.

All other information contained within the 2024 Delivery Statement remains valid and unchanged.

or

The information submitted in 2024 remains valid and unchanged

_____ (signature) _____ (date)

Delivery Statement for South Norfolk Council Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

SITE REFERENCE:

VC HAD1

SITE ADDRESS (as per the site allocation policy):

Land south of Haddiscoe Manor Farm

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Up to 35 dwellings on 3.13ha

DELIVERY STATEMENT COMPLETED BY (and on behalf of):

Emma Griffiths (Brown & Co) on behalf of landowner

DATE OF COMPLETION OF DELIVERY STATEMENT:

01.10.2024

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)

The site is considered to be available now, suitable for development of the type and scale proposed, and deliverable in accordance with local and national planning policy requirements. It is considered that any scheme could be suitably designed so as to appropriately conserve and protect the trees on site subject of the TPO, to provide safe and suitable access, and to accommodate at least a 10% uplift in biodiversity value.

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 control of a single owner, who is keen to progress the site. As part of this, the agents have had discussions with a number of housebuilders who have shown genuine interest in the site.

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 owners are currently in contract stages with a housebuilder to provide an option, enabling the housebuilder to progress with a planning application. Should permission be forthcoming then the housebuilder would purchase the site and deliver the approved scheme.

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)

If the Local Authority is prepared to accommodate submission we envisage an application within 12 months and depending upon outcome, reserved matters and start on site within 18 months thereafter.

Matter C, 43b

Site Allocation: VC BUR1, Land north of Staithe Road, Burgh St Peter

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

VC BUR1 is a new allocation for the VCHAP.

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

The site does not have planning permission and there are no planning applications currently under consideration on the 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 BUR1 is a greenfield site

Ownership position: The site is under sole ownership

Promotion by developer: Various developers have approached the landowner, but the decision has been taken to await adoption of the VCHAP before marketing the site and choosing a delivery partner

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	Yarmouth Road / A143	Toft Monks
Local shop	Various	Beccles
Village hall	Staithe Road	Burgh St Peter
Recreation ground	Staithe Road	Burgh St Peter
Other (bus stop)	Beccles Road	Burgh St Peter
Other (public house)	White Lion Road	Wheatacre
Other (employment)	Common Road	Aldeby

Due to the rural nature of the road network, there are no footpath connections available between the site and the services and facilities identified above.

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 BUR1 is well contained in the wider landscape although some views of the site may be visible from the Broads Authority area to the north. However, development on this site will be viewed in the context of the existing residential development at Burgh St Peter, particularly along Staithe Road, and the scale of development proposed is considered to be compatible. The site-specific policy requirements include reference to the site layout, design and landscaping in recognition of this sensitive context.

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](#))

Discussions with Anglian Water throughout the process highlighted the small-scale nature of the Wheatacre Church Lane Water Recycling Centre (WRC) and this is reflected in the site-specific policy wording, (as well as the proposed modification to paragraph 43.32 of the supporting text submitted alongside the Plan).

List of Additional Modifications and Potential Main Modifications Arising from the Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) and the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment NaFRA2 Addendum (May 2025) ([A.6.2](#))

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

Yes. Discussions with the highways authority identified a suite of on- and off-site highways works that would be required to ensure highway safety is maintained around the site. The detail of these is to be agreed at the planning application stage, as set out in both the supporting text and the site-specific policy wording.

g) Is the estimate of site capacity justified?

Yes. The limited capacity of the site reflects the context of the site.

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 Broads Authority and the highways 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.

The site promoter confirmed in the 2024 Delivery Statement that the site is deliverable in accordance with policy requirements following initial high-level viability work.

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 2024 Delivery Statement.

Anticipated planning application date: Planning application submission in spring 2026.

Commencement of works on site expected: Autumn 2026.

Completion expected: Spring 2027.

Delivery Statement: Supplementary/Amended Information
(October 2025)

SITE REFERENCE:

VC BUR1

SITE ADDRESS (as per the site allocation policy):

Land north of Staithe Road, Burgh St Peter

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

Jasmine Philpott (Durrants) on behalf of landowner, Richard Tripp

DATE OF COMPLETION OF SUPPLEMENTARY/ AMENDED INFORMATION:

16th 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).

or

The information submitted in 2024 remains valid and unchanged

J Philpott (Durrants) 16th October 2025

Delivery Statement for South Norfolk Council Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

SITE REFERENCE:

VC BUR1

SITE ADDRESS (as per the site allocation policy):

Land north of Staithe Road, Burgh St Peter

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

At least 12 dwellings on 0.56ha

DELIVERY STATEMENT COMPLETED BY (and on behalf of):

Jasmine Philpott (Durrants) on behalf of Richard Tripp (landowner)

DATE OF COMPLETION OF DELIVERY STATEMENT:

4th 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)

VCBUR1 remains available for development. The landowner and agent remain committed to bringing the site forward for development. The site is outside of any Nutrient Neutrality catchment. The landowner owns the land to the north, which is available for BNG offset if required. Initial high-level viability work indicates that the site remains available, suitable and deliverable.

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 owned by Richard Tripp. Various approaches have been made by promoters and developers, but the decision was taken to await adoption of the Plan before marketing the site and choosing a delivery partner.

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)

As above

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)

Assuming the site is sold to a developer, the likely timescales are: VCHAP adopted Winter 2025 / Site marketed for sale Winter 2025 / Submission of planning application Spring 2026 / Grant of planning permission and completion of sale Summer 2026. Start on site Autumn 2026. Site completion Spring 2027 (assuming a build rate of 2 per month).

Matter C, 43c and 43d

Settlement Limit: Toft Monks, Aldeby, Haddiscoe, Wheatacre and Burgh St Peter

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

Yes, the settlement limits for Toft Monks, Aldeby, Haddiscoe, Wheatacre and Burgh St Peter are suitable and justified.

The settlement limit for Toft Monks is drawn around the two main built areas of the village whilst excluding the open gap between them in order to reflect the existing built character of the area.

The settlement limits for Aldeby are centred around the two main concentrations of development on The Street and Common Road. They allow for very limited infill due to the lack of facilities locally and to prevent the further extension of development into the surrounding open countryside, in particular the adjacent valley landscape of the Waveney Valley.

The existing Haddiscoe settlement limits are made up of three parts, encompassing the main built areas along Rectory Road, The Street and Thorpe Road, and a small area along Beccles Road. The settlement limits respect the built form and protect the rural valley setting to the west, whilst also preventing further ribbon development.

In Burgh St Peter the settlement limit includes the main built form of the adjoining settlements, including built development that stretches into the Wheatacre Parish.

The settlement limit for Burgh St Peter and Wheatacre has been updated to include a small parcel of land west of Mill Road which has been promoted and assessed as part of the Plan process

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

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 Burgh St Peter and Wheatacre settlement limit is considered to be suitable under part (ii). The site represents a logical extension to the village and follows the existing built form without extending into the countryside beyond existing development. The site is located close to the village hall and employment areas.

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. The remaining development within the settlement of Wheatacre is sporadic and of low density.