

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3979	Norwich City Council (Joy Brown) [19730]		Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	Sustainability Appraisal, A.30	<p>Supportive of Council identifying sites to cover shortfall to meet minimum GNLP requirement and provide buffer.</p> <p>Do not intend to comment on individual sites but reiterate need for development to be planned in a sustainable way. Pleased to see adjustments made reflecting previous comments.</p> <p>Prior to submission South Norfolk Council should be satisfied that the option chosen will deliver housing in a sustainable manner and is informed by the findings of the SA.</p>	None stated.	Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1793	
4038	Ms Emily Nolan [20493]		Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	Sustainability Appraisal, A.30	The proposed developments are out of proportion with the villages, the houses will not be sustainable and these plans seem at odds with the net zero plans the UK has committed to. The building industry is one of the least sustainable. The use of green sites is inappropriate when there are plenty of brown field sites for housing.	The number one commitment needs to be sustainability.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1798	
4046	Ms Julie Bache [20359]		Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	Sustainability Appraisal, A.30	The VCHAP in and of itself is a non-sustainable plan. It was the brain-child of Michael Gove under the previous Conservative government and is set to disrupt villages all across England. It sets out to add 'small development's. Some of the sites are not small at all. For example: We have two proposed sites in Barford, totalling 65 houses. Our village less than 300 houses, so this would be a 20% uplift in housing in a TINY village with no facilities, other than a village hall and a garage (which itself would be demolished for the proposed 20 houses!)	The VCHAP should be changed to a TCHAP - i.e. Village to TOWN. Small towns can sustain developments of clusters of 20-45; but a village can (often) not. Housing allocations should be added to Towns, thus retaining villages to be just that, villages. Otherwise there will be nothing else apart from small towns, if all villages are developed and subject to the desire (not need) for 'growth'. Towns have shops/doctors and all sorts of infrastructure available which simply are not there in (most small) villages.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1798	

4126	Rainier Developments and Strategic Land [20498]	Ceres Property (Mr Sam Hollingworth, Associate Partner) [20500]	Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	Sustainability Appraisal, A.30	<p>As confirmed through case law (see Heard), whilst it is not necessary to keep open all options for the same level of detailed examination at all stages, at each stage the preferred option and reasonable alternatives must be assessed to the same level of detail.</p> <p>GNLP3033 ('the Site') was expressly identified earlier within the plan-making process as a reasonable alternative. However, it does not appear to have been assessed at all as part of the Regulation 19 Addendum SA, let alone to the same level of detail as the sites that are proposed for allocation.</p> <p>The lack of assessment of this site-specific alternative is a concern in terms of compliance with the SEA Regulations.</p> <p>Additionally, no consideration appears to have been given as part of the SEA process as to whether Long Stratton, as a settlement, should accommodate some of the new residential site allocations required for the VCHAP.</p> <p>Separately, Regulation 13 concerns the procedural requirements of consultation on the SEA. It requires inter alia that, as soon as reasonably practicable after the preparation of the SEA, the responsible authority should bring it to the attention of persons who are affected or likely to be affected by, or have an interest in its findings.</p> <p>Two concerns arise from this relating to the Regulation 19 Addendum SA .</p>	<p>The Cogent3 judgment confirms defects in the SEA process can be resolved, even at a very late stage in the plan-making process. However, it is important to recognise that an important lesson from Cogent was that additional requirements to ensure the SEA process complies with the SEA Regulations.</p> <p>As part of the measures to ensure a legally complaint SEA, we suggest it will be necessary to appraisal all reasonable alternatives, including directing growth to Long Stratton and, specifically, appraising GNLP3033.</p> <p>For the reasons described above, even if appraisal of additional sites and options through SEA was not required, it would nevertheless be necessary to undertake consultation on the Regulation 19 SA Addendum, given the apparent lack of consultation on the Environmental Report itself to date.</p> <p>In considering the Site / GNLP3033 in relation to the SA objectives and framework in the Regulation 19 Addendum SA, it is evident that it would score positively (sustainable location, access to facilities, bus services, ecological designations, agricultural value, Conservation Area).</p>	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1799	<p>Rainier Developments - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stn</p> <p>Rainier Developments Vision - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3t</p>
----------------------	---	---	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	--	---------------	--	--------	----	----	----	------	--

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
					<p>Firstly, it is not clear if an Environmental Report was prepared to support the Regulation 18 iteration of the Addendum to the VCHAP. If it was, then Rainier should, as interested persons, have been consulted on this. If it was not, then this would give rise to a different concern, given the need for plans to be informed by sustainability appraisal which meets legal requirements throughout their preparation (NPPF paragraph 32).</p> <p>Secondly, it is not clear from the information available via the website that comments are being invited on the Regulation 19 Addendum SA itself. The online consultation portal does not appear to have a facility for commenting on the Regulation 19 Addendum SA, only the Regulation 19 Addendum.</p>									
4129	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	Sustainability Appraisal, A.30	The VCHAP is not a sustainable proposition. It is a disruptive plan to many villages. It does not always offer small sites as it claims. Some are large and the ones for Barford are out of scale with the size of this village. There are currently no facilities in Barford other than the small school, garage and village hall. The latter two are threatened by the two developments currently proposed. Increasing the housing stock by 20% is excessive and should be reviewed.	The VCHAP is a one size fits all policy which should be reviewed and changed by the new Government. It is not fit for purpose. Small quiet villages like Barford having such a large increase in population is neither necessary nor welcome. The lack of facilities here in our village do not facilitate yet more housing.The plan should be scrapped.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1798	

4169	Rainier Developments and Strategic Land [20498]	Ceres Property (Mr Sam Hollingworth, Associate Partner) [20500]	Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	Sustainability Appraisal, A.30	<p>As confirmed through case law (see Heard), whilst it is not necessary to keep open all options for the same level of detailed examination at all stages, at each stage the preferred option and reasonable alternatives must be assessed to the same level of detail.</p> <p>GNLP0321 and GNLP1023 (which together constitute the Site) were expressly identified earlier within the plan-making process as reasonable alternatives. Despite this, it appears that they have not been considered as potential allocation through the Regulation 19 Addendum SA, let alone to the same level of detail as the sites that are proposed for allocation.</p> <p>The lack of assessment of this site-specific alternative is a concern in terms of compliance with the SEA Regulations.</p> <p>Additionally, no consideration appears to have been given as part of the SEA process as to whether Poringland / Framingham Earl, as a settlement, should accommodate some of the new residential site allocations required for the VCHAP.</p> <p>In considering the Site in relation to the SA objectives and framework in the Regulation 19 Addendum SA, we consider it would be assessed as having a number of positive impacts and identified as a sustainable site for residential development.</p> <p>Located in sustainable location, access to bus services, no ecological designations, low</p>	<p>The Cogent3 judgment confirms defects in the SEA process can be resolved, even at a very late stage in the plan-making process. However, it is important to recognise that an important lesson from Cogent was that additional requirements to ensure the SEA process complies with the SEA Regulations.</p> <p>Having regard to all of the above, in the preparation of an Environmental Report that properly considered the Site, as required given that it is an amalgamation of two reasonable alternatives, and assessed it to the same level of detail as required, the Site would represent an eminently sustainable option for growth. It is submitted that it would be a more sustainable option than the additional sites that the Regulation 19 Addendum proposes to allocate.</p>	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1799	<p>Rainier and Octagon - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s34</p> <p>Rainier and Octagon Appendix A - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s35</p> <p>Rainier and Octagon Appendix B - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s36</p>
----------------------	---	---	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	--	---------------	--	--------	----	----	----	------	--

[illegible]

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
<u>4201</u>	Natural England (Norfolk and Suffolk) (Ms Louise Oliver, Higher officer - Sustainable Development) [20504]		Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	Sustainability Appraisal, A.30	<p>Natural England has no comments to make on the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (SNVCHAP) - Regulation 19 Pre-submission Addendum.</p> <p>Natural England is broadly satisfied and in agreement with the findings of both the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the SNVCHAP – SA Report Update (AECOM, June 2024), and the updated Habitats Regulations Assessment of the SNVCHAP (Lepus Consulting, June 2024), which considers the final choice of sites included in the above addendum document.</p> <p>We have no further comments to make at this stage.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1794	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4205	KCS Development Ltd [19681]	Cara Chambers [20476]	Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	Sustainability Appraisal, A.30	<p>(Representation relates to VC SPO1)</p> <p>The updated Sustainability Appraisal re-confirms the conclusions of the previous Sustainability Appraisal, and confirms:</p> <p>‘Spooner Row stands-out on account of rail connectivity, albeit there is a very limited service, and there is not thought to be any potential for an improved service, in the context of the current plan. The village is also close to the A11, but regular bus services do not pass through the village.’ The report also flagged Spooner Row as: “... one example of a village where the potential for higher growth to consolidate the built form, and potentially deliver-on place-making objectives, might be envisaged. However, this is highly uncertain, as there is a need to give weight to protecting the existing character of the settlement...”</p> <p>We welcome these continued conclusions that Spooner Row, and the site, are sustainable.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1797	KCS Development - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s3f
4047	Ms Julie Bache [20359]		Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)	Habitats Regulation Assessment, A.31	We have so much wildlife here in our village that would be impacted by loss of habitat in the proposed sites. Recently there was a polecat siting in the place where the garage (and second allocation proposed) stands.	The plan should be amended. The garage site removed from the allocations and the village hall site should be reduced substantially. 10 houses would be more appropriate in that site and the village. 45 simply isn't viable and the site is already often flooded; something which will be increased if there are houses built there.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1800	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4130	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)	Habitats Regulation Assessment, A.31	There is a lot of wildlife in Barford village and the surrounding fields and woodland. There would be an impact upon this with the proposed development through disruption and impact and loss of habitat.	The plan should be amended. The proposed garage site should be removed from the allocation and the village hall site reduced to a maximum of ten houses. 45 new homes on that site is too many. There are existing drainage issues on that site which would only be made worse by adding so many houses. There is not the infrastructure in Barford to accommodate more residents. The plan is simply not viable.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1800	
4202	Natural England (Norfolk and Suffolk) (Ms Louise Oliver, Higher officer - Sustainable Development) [20504]		Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)	Habitats Regulation Assessment, A.31	<p>Natural England has no comments to make on the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (SNVCHAP) - Regulation 19 Pre-submission Addendum.</p> <p>Natural England is broadly satisfied and in agreement with the findings of both the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the SNVCHAP – SA Report Update (AECOM, June 2024), and the updated Habitats Regulations Assessment of the SNVCHAP (Lepus Consulting, June 2024), which considers the final choice of sites included in the above addendum document.</p> <p>We have no further comments to make at this stage.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1795	
4049	Ms Julie Bache [20359]		Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA)	Heritage Impact Assessments , A.32	We have a listed single storey building (Sayers Farm) directly opposite the garage site. This would be blighted by having 20 new build two storey houses directly opposite it.	The garage plan should be scrapped entirely and the village hall site reduced to a maximum of 10 houses.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1801	
4131	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA)	Heritage Impact Assessments , A.32	Sayers Farm, opposite the proposed garage site, is a listed building. This would be affected by having 20 new build homes opposite it.	The garage plan should be scrapped and the village hall site rescued to ten homes maximum.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1801	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4050	Ms Julie Bache [20359]		Landscape and Visual Appraisals (LVA)	Landscape and Visual Appraisals, A.33	A house estate as one enters the village from the west would impact the visual appearance of the village boundary enormously. There are currently many very mature trees on the site which need to be saved from demolition.	The garage site should be scrapped entirely.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1802	
4079	Mrs Aleksandra Hyett [20293]		Landscape and Visual Appraisals (LVA)	Landscape and Visual Appraisals, A.33	previous reg 18 landscape assessment recommended that any development on the north site is limited to maintain the open countryside. Reg 19 proposal and assessment contradicts with this view. The leaner character of the village should be maintain.	exclude VCBAR2 from the project	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1803	
4132	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		Landscape and Visual Appraisals (LVA)	Landscape and Visual Appraisals, A.33	The visual impact of a new housing estate upon entering the village of Barford would be huge and detrimental. There are currently mature oak trees on the site which would need to be saved for the existing beauty of the village. These would be at risk if development took place.	Scrap the garage plan entirely	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1802	
4053	Ms Julie Bache [20359]		Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, A.34	Our village was under water for many months in 2023. The village hall proposed site is a well-known flood pain, effectively and it's unusable after heavy rains. Rainfall is expected to increase year on year, so how is it possible to improve the flood protection in a village by building on the very land which soaks in the flood waters?	Plan should be scrapped for Barford. The flood risks (see historical data) are too high. And it happens too frequently.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1806	
4138	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, A.34	Barford has been affected by flooding greatly recently. The river has been at bursting point at the bridge. The proposed village hall site already is affected by flooding so development will only make this worse.	The Barford plan should be scrapped entirely. The flood risks and risk to wildlife make it unfeasible.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1806	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3858	Mr Ian Beharrell [20463]		Water Cycle Study (WCS)	Water Cycle Study, A.35	Re: Aslacton Proposed Site: For many years sewer system does not have adequate capacity and too frequently we have sewage in the streets. Planners continue to approve developments making the problem worse. Madness and in effect approval of developments is South Norfolk Planning approving ever more sewage in our streets.	No further approval of any developments in the Aslacton sewage catchment area until the sewage system capacity is resolved such that we no longer too often have sewage in the street. Given that this has been an issue for many many years it would seem unlikely there will be any resolution in the near future.	Appearance at Examination	Because planners repeatedly fail to appreciate or act in the light of Aslacton residents having to endure sewage in the street. Tax payers and residents endure the consequences of a situation made ever worse by planners as they repeatedly fail to listen to resident and Parish Council comments.	Object	No	No	No	1807	
4055	Ms Julie Bache [20359]		Water Cycle Study (WCS)	Water Cycle Study, A.35	In the WCS report provided, the allocation is as follows: BAR1 19 houses, BAR2, 40 houses. However, the latest proposals show 20 and 45 respectively. Surely a revised WCS report is now required?	Revision of WCS report and further consultation following the results of that.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1808	
4141	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		Water Cycle Study (WCS)	Water Cycle Study, A.35	It appears a revised WCS is required as in the WCS report provided, the allocation is BAR1 19 houses and BAR2 40 houses. However the latests proposals show 20 houses and 45 houses respectively.	Revised WCS report and further consultation following the results thereof	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1808	

4186	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		Water Cycle Study (WCS)	Water Cycle Study, A.35	<p>The WCS sets out the parameters for assessing the headroom or capacity of Anglian Water’s water recycling centres to accommodate the growth proposed in the SNVCHAP. In Section 3.1.1 Wastewater treatment assessment approach, and the sub-heading ‘Environmental Capacity Assessment’ there is a statement regarding WRCs with descriptive consents. A general parameter of whether allocated growth would exceed a population of 250 was used to determine whether environmental capacity would be impacted.</p> <p>It is correct that many descriptive permits require a population equivalent of less than 250. Descriptive permits apply to small water recycling centres (WRCs) serving a small number of properties or a small settlement – often collectively referred to as ‘descriptive works’. These descriptive permits are for a low-risk discharge which does not contain any numerical limit conditions for the discharge but relies on descriptive conditions only – meaning there is no requirement for flow measurement at these sites. A descriptive permit generally applies when the WRC serves a population equivalent (PE) less than 250, with no trade effluent accepted at the works, and no potable water supply intakes downstream that are likely to be adversely affected. The Environment Agency (EA) will also assess whether there is any significant environmental or amenity impact before they grant a descriptive permit.</p> <p>However, when looking in detail at the parameters of the permits many of the descriptive works are based on different descriptive standards that can apply to a much smaller</p>		Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1844	Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s3v
------	---	--	-------------------------	-------------------------	---	--	---------------	--	--------	-----	----	-----	------	---

					<p>population or cubic metres per day of flow that can restrict the capacity available. The descriptive permits for the following WRCs have a specification for a volume discharge which would equate to populations much lower than 250 and limits the feasibility of connections for proposed growth in these locations:</p> <p>School Lane Spooner Row WRC - 17.65 cubic metres per day,</p> <p>Haddiscoe-Mock Mile Terr WRC - 14.9 cubic metres per day</p> <p>Winfarthing - Chapel Close WRC - 10 cubic metres per day.</p> <p>It is noted that a number of WRCs in Appendix B are identified as exceeding headroom capacityonce growth from the Greater Norwich Local Plan and SNVCHAP are factored in. Some of these have sufficient capacity for growth coming forward and will require subsequent growth investment in later AMPs, whereas WRCs such as Whitlingham and Beccles have already been identified for growth schemes to increase dry weather flow capacity in AMP8 (subject to final determination of our PR24 Business Plan by Ofwat at the end of 2024).</p> <p>Anglian Water welcomes the further opportunity to engage with the plan preparation and will continue to liaise with the Council to support the plan and the relevant evidence base documents towards submission.</p>									
4037	Mr Richard Williamson [20491]		Viability Appraisal (VA)	Viability Appraisal, A.36	Specifically about the Barford project		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1796	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
					I believe this is a good project from which the whole village will benefit and so it should be supported.									
4059	Ms Julie Bache [20359]		Viability Appraisal (VA)	Viability Appraisal, A.36	According to the viability report provided, the types of developments proposed in the village are not economically viable and will leave a developer with a deficit.	Both the proposed allocations should be removed from Barford, BAR1 & BAR2. Both are unsound and not viable in the current economic conditions. The new Labour government should review its adoption of Conservative policies and adapt those accordingly.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1809	
4143	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		Viability Appraisal (VA)	Viability Appraisal, A.36	According to the viability report provided the types of development proposed are not economically viable	Both the proposed allocations BAR1 & BAR2 should be removed from Barford. Both are unsound and not viable in the current economic conditions. The policies under the previous government should be reviewed and adapted accordingly.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1809	
3905	Barford & Wramplingham Parish Council (Barford and Wramplingham Parish Clerk) [12696]		Services and Community Facilities, 1.8	Services and Community Facilities, 4.8	The bus service from Marlingford to Wymondham is infrequent, not daily. Why is this still incorrectly described? Have previous consultations been ignored.	Please update your information accordingly	Appearance at Examination	Somebody from the Parish Council can bring local knowledge to bear.	Object	No	No	No	1787	BWPC VCHAP response Para 1.8.pdf - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.ox2.uk/a/sss
3912	Mr Nigel Ireson [20401]		Services and Community Facilities, 1.8	Services and Community Facilities, 4.8	Barford is an isolated village with only a village hall and small primary school, no local shops, very limited / infrequent bus services - Totally car dependant	The plan is unviable	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1787	
3922	Miss Lisa Jordan [20465]		Services and Community Facilities, 1.8	Services and Community Facilities, 4.8	The bus service from Marlingford to Wymondham is infrequent, not daily. Why is this still incorrectly described? Have previous consultations been ignored.	There should be no development on BAR2 for the reasons shown in other sections.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1787	
3924	Miss Lisa Jordan [20465]		Services and Community Facilities, 1.8	Services and Community Facilities, 4.8	The bus service from Marlingford to Wymondham is infrequent, not daily. Why is this still incorrectly described? Have previous consultations been ignored. See other sections also.	There should be no development on BAR2. See other sections.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1787	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3929	Mrs Rosanna Kellingray [20333]		Services and Community Facilities, 1.8	Services and Community Facilities, 4.8	<p>1. Colton does not have significant employment opportunity</p> <p>2. The industrial and commercial units are not in the centre of Barford, and they provided very minial local employment opportunities.</p>	<p>1. This sentence should be removed.</p> <p>2. This sentence should be changed to 'There are a few industrial and commercial units located on the outskirts of the village, which provide minimal local employment opportunities.'</p>	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	No	1787	
4027	Mrs Bridget Whittell [20337]		Services and Community Facilities, 1.8	Services and Community Facilities, 4.8	<p>Barford is a small village that doesn't even have a shop. It does have a garage and MOT centre that is well used by villagers, but under the proposed VC BAR1 development, you are proposing to demolish this. There is an hourly bus service to Norwich, but to get elsewhere, most people are reliant on their cars. The nearest GP surgeries are located at Hethersett and Wymondham and these are already over-subscribed.</p>	<p>The current plan is not viable. It focuses attention on building houses, but not the necessary services and infrastructure that the village needs to sustain the increase in housing being suggested.</p>	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1787	
4067	Ben Herring [20336]		Services and Community Facilities, 1.8	Services and Community Facilities, 4.8	<p>Inaccurate and misleading information in general here:</p> <p>- 'Several' is an overestimate of industrial units and they are also on the periphery of the village, rather than at the centre. They are also of a specialist nature and so not open employment opportunities. Some of these would also be removed, should VCBAR1 go ahead.</p> <p>- Marlingford bus to Wymondham is infrequent, not daily</p> <p>- 'Significant local employment opportunities' - where are these?</p> <p>Barford lacks appropriate infrastructure to support such a development. It is car dependant and will only become more so with development, which is not supportive of a green agenda.</p>	<p>To take out the superlative use of language (e.g. 'significant') where there is no basis for this, which will mislead the interpretation of setting for the development.</p>	Appearance at Examination	This development would have a significant impact on the village in which I live	Object	No	No	No	1787	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4149	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		Services and Community Facilities, 1.8	Services and Community Facilities, 4.8	Whilst the removal of the third proposed site west of back Lane Barford is welcomed the other two sites add nothing to the village. There are few amenities in Barford. The garage being one of them. If the garage site went ahead that would be an economic loss to the village.	The garage site (BAR2) should be removed from the plan	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1787	
3869	Mrs Mary Dorrell [15168]		Barford, 1.10	Barford, 4.10	The Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme is dependent on downstream maintenance of a network of privately owned surface water ditches that lead to the River Tiffey. These are largely not accessible to machinery and have to be hand dug/cleared by their increasingly elderly owners. Not all new owners understand their legal responsibilities to do so. For these reasons the network may well be operating at well below capacity even with the existing number of houses, road layout etc.	Please consider how water exits the Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme, how it reaches the River Tiffey and how it can be maintained in good/effective working order.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1870	
3906	Barford & Wramplingham Parish Council (Barford and Wramplingham Parish Clerk) [12696]		Barford, 1.10	Barford, 4.10	The Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme is unlikely to cope with the 25-30% increase in dwellings proposed under the VCHAP scheme. Barford and Wramplingham Parish Council is not aware of any assessment for this issue by Anglian Water or any other body. This would make the VCHAP proposal unsound as defined by the VCHAP Duty to Cooperate Statement. The Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme is dependent on downstream maintenance of a network of privately owned surface water ditches that lead to the River Tiffey. These are largely not accessible to machinery and have to be hand cleared by their increasingly elderly owners.	Please comply with NPPF Clause 165 Please comply with the duty to cooperate: It is essential that Anglian Water are consulted, and a full response obtained. See later sections of our response also.	Appearance at Examination	Somebody from Barford and Wramplingham Parish Council can bring local knowledge to bear.	Object	No	No	No	1870	BWPC VCHAP response Para 1.10.pdf - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/sst

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3911	Mr Nigel Ireson [20401]		Barford, 1.10	Barford, 4.10	Historic unresolved flooding problems within Barford - The network is still obviously inadequate and operating at well below capacity even with the existing number of houses, road layout etc. - It would not be able to cope with the proposed increase of dwellings, roads and hardstanding's.	This scheme is unviable with the current flooding problems - This serious issue would need to be resolved and made adequate for the additional proposed increase of dwellings, roads and hardstanding's.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1870	
3923	Miss Lisa Jordan [20465]		Barford, 1.10	Barford, 4.10	<p>The Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme is unlikely to cope with the 25-30% increase in dwellings</p> <p>proposed under the VCHAP scheme. We are not aware of</p> <p>any assessment for this issue by Anglian Water or any other body. This would make the VCHAP</p> <p>proposal unsound as defined by the VCHAP Duty to Cooperate Statement. The Barford Flood</p> <p>Alleviation Scheme is dependent on downstream maintenance of a network of privately owned surface water ditches that lead to the River Tiffey. These are largely not accessible to</p> <p>machinery and have to be hand cleared by their increasingly elderly owners</p>	There should be no development on BAR2. See other sections.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1870	
4006	Dr Keith Waldron [15165]		Barford, 1.10	Barford, 4.10	- I wish to highlight risk of flood and sewage release, which has been an ongoing problem for parts of Barford and Wramplingham for decades. As highlighted by another resident, the Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme is dependent on downstream maintenance of a network of privately owned surface water ditches that lead to the River Tiffey. These are largely inaccessible to machinery and must be hand dug/cleared. For these reasons the network may well be operating at well below capacity even with the existing number of houses, road layout etc.	I request that the local authority engages effectively with the community and the Parish Council (for local knowledge), and Anglian Water Services (particularly the department that deals with flooding and sewage release in Barford) and the Environment agency, so that the maintenance and capacity of the routes by which water exits the Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme and how it reaches the River Tiffey are taken into account for all the proposed VCHAP developments in Barford.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1870	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4028	Mrs Bridget Whittell [20337]		Barford, 1.10	Barford, 4.10	Proposed development contravenes flood alleviation advice and regulations which advise against inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding. Most of Barford is a flood plain area which helps to explain the limited housing development that has, thus far, taken place. The existing Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme is unlikely to cope with the proposed 25-30% increase in housing proposed under the VCHAP scheme. The long term problem of flooding in the village is well documented and so far measures taken have only ameliorated, but not resolved, the situation. The proposed allocation in this plan will only exacerbate the flooding problem.	Serious consideration needs to be given to how flooding issues in the village can be satisfactorily resolved BEFORE any new houses are built. It is disappointing that Anglia Water have informed Barford & Wrampingham Parish Council that they "are not currently in a position to share a response to this consultation and unlikely to finalise our response prior to the consultation closing date owing to current workloads and intervening consultation priorities..."	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1870	
4060	Ms Julie Bache [20359]		Barford, 1.10	Barford, 4.10	The removal of the third proposed site on Back Lane/Watton road is welcomed.	The Garage site (BAR2) should also be removed, for both road safety, flooding and viability issues.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1871	
4068	Ben Herring [20336]		Barford, 1.10	Barford, 4.10	<p>The information provided here is inaccurate, potentially misleading and shows a lack of understanding of the flood scheme:</p> <p>- 'which helps control flooding in the village' - this is untrue. With levels of surface water seen in the village on regular occasions, the scheme does very little to control flooding. This remains a huge problem in the village, with several events in 2024.</p> <p>- The Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme (BFAS) relies on maintenance (e.g. ditches) by private landowners, many of whom do not know their responsibility to do this, or are unable to do so.</p>	<p>- There should be text here about the significant surface water issues in the village</p> <p>- There should be a proper in-person assessment of the BFAS to understand its limitations and how it can be improved</p> <p>- The VCBAR2 site should be excluded as it plays a significant part of the village's surface water flow and decreasing the permeability of this area, with development, will only worsen the issue.</p> <p>- Should it be seen as fit as a site, there should be explicit indemnity provided by the developer, for the villagers, should there be floodwater damage to homes during/after the development</p>	Appearance at Examination	Significant impact on my village	Object	No	No	No	1870	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4082	Mrs Aleksandra Hyett [20293]		Barford, 1.10	Barford, 4.10	Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme is only partially effective, unfortunately drainage and flooding issue are persistent within the village. These issue are reported and well documented. Ongoing work with Anglian Water to investigate much needed improvements. Unfortunately, the many housing developments upstream (Wymondham, Wicklewood) have contributed to ongoing and worsening issues downstream inc in Barford. Further development in the areas inc Barford will contribute to this issue further. Barford is located at the fork of 2 rivers and is prone to flooding.	exclude VC BAR2 from the project	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1870	
4092	Mr Paul Dick [20278]		Barford, 1.10	Barford, 4.10	Barford has suffered from surface water flooding for years - read the Barford Surface Water Drainage Investigation Consultation Report conducted for South Norfolk Council dated 17.9.2008 by Bingham Hall Associates. The SNC spent thousands at the time with no impact. More development and increased impervious surfaces will only add to this	No further development on a flood plain	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1870	
4151	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		Barford, 1.10	Barford, 4.10	As this says - much of the central part of Barford forms part of the Barford Flood alleviation scheme. It doesnt make sense to keep building in Barford.	Scrap BAR1 & BAR2	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1870	
3870	Mrs Mary Dorrell [15168]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Flooding. Surface water from this site already causes problems on the B1108 and also affects properties in Cock Street, Sutton's Loke (private road) and Style Loke. This has all been reported to NCC Highways and not yet resolved.	Flooding and drainage is an issue in the lower lying parts of Barford. Please consider how water exits the Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme, how it reaches the River Tiffey and how it can be maintained in good/effective working order.	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	No	1874	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3879	Mrs KIRSTY HENRY [20467]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	This plan will significantly disrupt the village, the village does not have the facilities or amenities to support this number of extra houses. This area is of importance ecologically, sustaining a large number of wildlife due to its open space, treeline (including a natural treeline planted for the silver jubilee & the millennium), and damp areas due to the poor drainage of the field attracts frogs, newts and other species. The field already floods badly, building here will cause significant flooding lower in the village which is already (and still despite the allieviation scheme) experiencing regular flooding and sewage backlog.	Abandon the plan	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1874	
3907	Barford & Wramplingham Parish Council (Barford and Wramplingham Parish Clerk) [12696]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	The site specific allocation is unsound, undeliverable, not justified, and contrary to specific provisions of NPPF and local plan policies. The Parish Council object to this allocation. If approved a covenant should be placed on land adjacent to restrict further development on greenfield sites. Sewage systems should be guaranteed (and indemnified by SNCD) to maintain nutrient neutrality and not cause any flood or pollution. Flood risk from run-off should be mitigated on site to prevent flooding in "Suttons Loke" and Style Loke. A full traffic safety evaluation must be carried out to ensure road safety on the B1108 double blind-bend.	Please comply with the regulations specified above, and ensure local knowledge is sought.	Appearance at Examination	Somebody from the Parish Council can bring local knowledge to bear.	Object	No	No	No	1874	BWPC VCHAP response VCBAR1 policy.pdf - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ss3

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3925	Miss Lisa Jordan [20465]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	The site specific allocation is unsound, undeliverable, not justified, and contrary to specific provisions of NPPF and local plan policies. We object to this allocation. If approved a covenant should be placed on land adjacent to restrict further development on greenfield sites. Sewage systems should be guaranteed (and indemnified by SNCD) to maintain nutrient neutrality and not cause any flood or pollution. Flood risk from run-off should be mitigated on site to prevent flooding in "Suttons Loke" and Style Loke. A full traffic safety evaluation must be carried out to ensure road safety on the B1108 double blind-bend.	There should be no development on BAR1. See other sections.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1874	
3930	Mrs Rosanna Kellingray [20333]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	<p>The junction between the B1108 and Cock Street opposite the Cock Pub is extremeley dangerous. To have this volume of people crossing Cock Street so close to the junction, to get to the footpath which is on the opposite side to the development, would be extremeley dangerous.</p> <p>Also Cock Street only has a narrow footpath on one side. If this footpath is to be used by a significant number of additional pedestrians as a result of the development, then a condition within the plan should be that speed restrictions to 20mph are enforced on Cock Street.</p>	A condition of the plan should be that speed restrictions to 20mph are enforced on Cock Street.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1874	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
<u>4010</u>	Mrs Paula Aspland [20328]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	<p>Plan is not legally compliant.</p> <p>Would severely impact Grade II listed Sayers Farm and remove only safe place to access village centre by foot. Bend is very dangerous with accidents witnessed which will increase with traffic.</p> <p>Agree with Parish Councils response.</p> <p>Scheme is not Sound due to land ownership, traffic concerns, flooding and environment.</p> <p>Duty to Cooperate has not been complied with due to water, sewerage and traffic. Watton Road flood after heavy rain.</p>	Object to allocation.	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1874	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4012	Mrs Emma Macconnachie [20335]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	<p>Plan is not legally compliant.</p> <p>Severe impact on Sayers Farm. Site is only safe area to proceed to village centre on foot and is used daily by children during term time. This is of paramount importance and severely compromised if this scheme went ahead.</p> <p>Agree with comments by Parish Council is response to his consultation.</p> <p>Plan is not sound due to land ownership, traffic concerns, flooding and employment.</p> <p>Does not comply with duty to cooperate due to water, sewerage and Anglian Water issues.</p>	Object to allocation.	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1874	
4029	Mrs Bridget Whittell [20337]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	<p>Fail to see how the redevelopment of this site "provides an opportunity to enhance the local townscape." It will involve knocking down the existing garage and associated buildings currently occupied by four businesses that provide employment to around a dozen employees. As well as this loss of local employment which surely contravenes the delivery of sustainable development, it will be a loss to the villagers of a valuable service amenity (garage, MOT centre, second hand car sales). Also the current landowner has clearly indicated the site is NOT available for development during his lifetime, so shouldn't be included in VCHAP.</p>	The VC BAR1 plan is not currently viable and probably won't be for at least 5 years or more.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1874	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4057	Mrs Lucy McKay [20495]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Please see my attached document	<p>- Flooding will increase and cause significant physical, financial and mental health impacts on our local residents, and within the surrounding neighbourhoods. The storm water considerations have not been considered here, which is the reality of what will happen.</p> <p>- Traffic and Highways dangers</p> <p>- Lack of sustainability considerations as referred to under Section 19 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>These include: insufficient Active Travel Solutions, (inadequate footpaths, bus services, safe cycle facilities, employment opportunities, amenities such as shops, restaurants, pubs, libraries, healthcare access and much more)</p>	Appearance at Examination	I am likely to be involved in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan working group. This group will aim to seek the views and opinions of a range of stakeholders in the community and want the village wants for it's future. So that we have an more of an active and collaborative say and input in the future of the sustainability of our village, for the generations to come.	Object	No	No	No	1874	Barford VCHAP objection - Oct24 - Lucy McKay .docx - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/stb
4061	Ms Julie Bache [20359]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	The site is unviable as a residential development. There are (already identified) road safety issues, along with the increased flood risk and lastly the cosmetic appearance will alter the village west-side entirely.	This allocation should be removed. It is both unsound and unviable.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1874	
4083	Mrs Leanne W [20496]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Allowing development in an area that has experienced, and remains at considerable risk of flooding in negligent. The current sewerage system often overflows effluent into properties on Eastleigh Gardens and Park Avenue.	There should be no development in a village at significant risk of flooding.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1874	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4133	Environment Agency (Alasdair Hain-Cole, Planning Officer) [20421]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	<p>Current data shows limited capacity at Barford Water Recycling Centre (WRC). While there may be some room for limited growth, the proposed allocations and resulting increase in foul water flows pose the potential risk of harm to the waterbody receiving treated effluent from Barford WRC.</p> <p>We therefore recommend including within policies VC BAR1 and VC BAR2 the requirement for developers of the site to enter into early engagement with Anglian Water in order to demonstrate there is sufficient capacity in the network and receiving WRC to accommodate foul flows from the development.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1867	

4146	Mr Reenesh Prakash [20501]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	<p>The proposed development of 20 dwellings on 0.76 hectares raises several concerns. Increased traffic on Cock Street could strain the local road network and compromise safety, while pedestrian infrastructure may be insufficient. The development may threaten mature trees and local biodiversity, and its flood risk mitigation could be inadequate, especially given the site's susceptibility to groundwater flooding. The project could negatively impact local heritage, particularly The Cock Inn, and the high-density housing may not fit the area's character. Additionally, contamination from the former garage use and strain on local infrastructure, including utilities and services, are potential issues.</p>	<p>Several changes could be made to the development plan to address potential concerns:</p> <p>1. Traffic and Pedestrian Safety</p> <p>Limit the Number of Dwellings: Reducing the number of units may alleviate traffic pressure on Cock Street and improve safety at the junction with B1108.</p> <p>Enhanced Pedestrian Infrastructure: Widen the proposed footpath along Cock Street and improve pedestrian crossings, especially near junctions and the pedestrian link to Back Lane.</p> <p>2. Environmental and Tree Protection</p> <p>Stronger Tree Protections: Include detailed measures to safeguard the central tree belt and surrounding vegetation, ensuring minimal disturbance during and after construction.</p> <p>Wildlife Habitat: Incorporate additional green spaces or nature corridors to preserve local biodiversity and mitigate environmental disruption.</p> <p>3. Flood Risk Management</p> <p>Comprehensive Flood Mitigation: Strengthen flood risk mitigation plans by incorporating sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) like permeable pavements, rain gardens, and additional drainage channels to manage surface water effectively.</p> <p>4. Heritage and Aesthetics</p>	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1874	
------	----------------------------	--	---	---	--	---	------------------------	--	--------	----	----	----	------	--

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
						<p>Lower Density, Sympathetic Design: Opt for fewer, more spacious homes with designs that reflect the local character and heritage, minimizing the visual impact on nearby historical assets like The Cock Inn and Sayer's Farm.</p> <p>5. Contamination and Health Safeguards</p> <p>Thorough Contamination Remediation: Ensure the contamination surveys are comprehensive and implement robust remediation measures before construction, with ongoing monitoring to safeguard future residents.</p> <p>6. Infrastructure and Community Resources</p> <p>Infrastructure Assessment: Carry out a detailed impact assessment on local infrastructure, including schools, healthcare, utilities, and sewage, and provide appropriate upgrades to ensure they can support the new population.</p> <p>These adjustments would help create a more sustainable, community-friendly development while addressing environmental, safety, and heritage concerns.</p>								
4153	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Residential development would not be viable on this site. There are also road safety issues to take into account, increased flood risk and there is the visual appearance to take into account.	This allocation should be removed as it is unviable and unsound	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1874	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4208	NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (Mr Thomas Clare, ICS Estates Planning Liaison and Policy Lead) [20478]		Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	Policy VC BAR1: Land at Cock Street and Watton Road	<p>Proposed sites in Barford and Swardeston will increase pressure on already constrained GP practices in Hethersett and Mulbarton, these Practices are part of the Humbleyard GP practice group. There are discussions currently ongoing between the Council and GP practices regarding mitigation for the amount of population growth these areas have already seen and that will be happening in the near future.</p> <p>The ambulance service, EEAST, are in a unique position that intersects health, transport and community safety and does not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development combined with other developments in the vicinity. This development is likely to increase demand upon existing constrained ambulance services and nationally set blue light response times. The capital required through developer contribution would form a proportion of the required funding for the provision of capacity to absorb the patient growth and demand generated by this development. Any funding would be used towards the capital cost of providing new additional ambulances and/or new additional medical equipment, which for an ambulance service is their physical infrastructure, and/or new additional parking space(s) for ambulances at existing ambulance stations.</p>	None specified. ICB encourages continued working with the LPA.	Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1866	NHS ICS Response - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3g
3859	Mr Jonathan Betts [20464]		VC BAR2	VC BAR2	The proposals if adopted would result in an unacceptable reduction in the playing area currently available and this would mean that events such as the annual cricket match and village events would become impossible.	The playing field in the proposed plan needs to be of the same size as is currently available.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1804	Petition_Cricket Pitch_Sep2024_Redacted.pdf - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s47

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3876	Mr Martin Henry [20466]		VC BAR2	VC BAR2	Will spoil a natural playing environment. Current pumping station will not cope with more housing & more waste water will continue to flood houses in park avenue	Scrap plan	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	No	1805	
3913	Mr Nigel Ireson [20401]		VC BAR2	VC BAR2	The site is located a long distance from many services such as shops and surgeries, secondary schools, and larger centres of employment. The local roads are very narrow and single lane in many places, therefore the use of cycling to access these services is unsafe, and makes the new development car and therefore carbon dependent	Plan is Unviable	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1805	
4039	Ms Emily Nolan [20493]		VC BAR2	VC BAR2	The land is still under lease to the parish council for another 36 years. How do you propose to build on this land legally?	The proposal for 45 homes is excessive. It will increase the levels of traffic in the village by at least 45 cars, but likely more. We have no facilities in the village, so every journey is by car. There will inevitably be an increase in pollution, the run off will effect our watercourses. There will be a decrease in air quality. There will be 45 houses worth of noise pollution and light pollution. These houses will not be affordable so how are they of benefit to the local community? The size of the development is out of proportion with the existing village. I understood the point of the cluster scheme was not to negatively effect the character of the existing settlement. This development plus the other proposed addition of 25 houses in VC BAR1 will increase the size of the village by 70 households.	Appearance at Examination	By email. We don't seem to be able to rely on the council to make decisions which don't have a negative impact on the environment, the people and the future of our county.	Object	No	No	No	1805	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
<u>4044</u>	Mrs KIRSTY HENRY [20467]		VC BAR2	VC BAR2	<p>I have 3 significant concerns:</p> <p>1. Flooding risk. This area is a flood plain, the building of this many houses will cause those further in the village to flood as the fowl water existing services are currently insufficient.</p> <p>2. Environmental damage to an area hosting a vast array of wildlife.</p> <p>3. Road safety with children having to cross the road to play (from the proposed car park site)</p>	Abandon the plan.	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	No	1805	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4052	Mrs Lucy McKay [20495]		VC BAR2	VC BAR2	xx	<p>VCHAP2 will add to the existing severe and life-crippling flooding in the valley. We object to the flood alleviation plans, because they are not compliant. The flooding plan contradicts 1.65 and will lead to increased flood consequences elsewhere. We refer to the 2017 statement from the Village Plan - ' flooding has become a nightmare and is unsound'.</p> <p>Already houses in the village suffer from regular sewerage flooding in their gardens which has to be manually pumped out.</p>	Appearance at Examination	<p>As a active member in the community, who is likely to be involved in the proposed co-ordination and production of a Village Neighbourhood Plan I would want to be included in such sessions.</p> <p>The proposed Village Neighbourhood Plan will set out the optimal ways to inclusively gather and collate information and views of local residents, from all stakeholders. This information will then be collated and we will put together a comprehensive plan that outlines what the community wants for it's future, and the best ways to realistically set out to achieve this.</p>	Object	No	No	No	1805	Barford VCHAP objection - Oct24 - Lucy McKay .docx - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/stv
4062	Ms Julie Bache [20359]		VC BAR2	VC BAR2	The proposal is now showing 45 houses planned for this site. The WCS report is only based on 40 so this is not applicable. A new viability report should be made, as well as the flood risk report as this site floods regularly. Always has done.	A new viability report should be made, as well as the flood risk report as a matter of urgency.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1805	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4070	Ben Herring [20336]		VC BAR2	VC BAR2	<p>I don't believe that this consultation has not followed the proper process and is discriminatory:</p> <p>- This consultation is particularly convoluted and uses a lot of jargon. It therefore puts several barriers in the way of those who wish to put their representations forward.</p> <p>- It has not been well advertised as to accommodate the full demographic of those living in the village.</p> <p>- The background documentation e.g. site assessment is based on the previously quoted lower number of houses and so is no longer valid</p>	<p>- VCBAR2 is not compliant and should be rejected.</p> <p>- A thorough internal assessment at the council as to how these consultations are conducted to ensure they are inclusive of everybody's views</p>	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1828	
4089	Mrs Leanne W [20496]		VC BAR2	VC BAR2	<p>We strenuously object to this development on the grounds of increased flood risk. 45 houses would increase the size of the village by a third. The development area is frequently wet and surface water run off is already considerable through neighbouring property. The risk of flooding is considerable for many properties within the village and any development would increase this. Flooding has been a permanent Parish Council agenda item for many years. Allowing this development would be totally negligent. A new village hall is no consolation to the occupants of a flooded home!</p>	<p>No development should take place in an area at risk of flooding.</p>	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1805	
4154	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		VC BAR2	VC BAR2	<p>The proposal has changed to now show 45 houses planned. The WCS report is based on 40 homes so this is no longer applicable. A new viability report should be made as well as flood risk report.</p>	<p>A new viability report should be made as well as flood risk report.</p>	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1805	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3914	Mr Nigel Ireson [20401]		VC BAR2, 1.20	VC BAR2, 4.20	Will spoil the current playing environment and is outside the village building boundary and the north field is agricultural land, Will have a negative impact on the local Ecology - Especially for Bats and other wildlife seen daily in the location	No changes would mitigate this situation	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1810	
3947	Mrs Valerie Broomhead [16921]		VC BAR2, 1.20	VC BAR2, 4.20	There are several inaccuracies in the submission which have failed to be corrected from the last consultation.	An outline plan of the concept would be useful. Easy to find and identify on the council site.	Appearance at Examination	To hear the proposal from the planners and question accordingly. This session should include ALL planners and service providers eg. Anglian Water, Highways, The school and police for traffic management. The public could then respond to the answers given.	Object	No	No	No	1810	
3967	Miss Lisa Jordan [20465]		VC BAR2, 1.20	VC BAR2, 4.20	The proposed site would mean a reduction in recreational green space for all residents. The proposed space would not be adequate for the historical cricket match that is held on this site. The North field is a treasured wildlife haven with a hunting barn owl seen regularly alongside many other species. There is no evidence that a wildlife species survey has been completed.	The site is unsuitable	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1810	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4030	Mrs Bridget Whittell [20337]		VC BAR2, 1.20	VC BAR2, 4.20	The current plan for the proposed site has a road running through the existing playing field. It considerably reduces the size of the playing field and the road will be an ongoing safety hazard for children in the playground/on the playing field. The plan does not take account of the fact that there is still 37 years remaining on the lease of the land on which the village hall, playing field and playground are located. Building houses on the agricultural field means yet another piece of rural landscape being permanently destroyed and wildlife displaced. Flooding issues will be exacerbated.	Current plan not viable. Before any plans are made to destroy (sorry, develop) yet more agricultural/green land, a survey should take place as to what wildlife will be affected/displaced and if any of them come under 'protected species' status. There are ongoing flooding issues in the village and before any more houses are built, these need to be seriously addressed. The problem of flooding will not only be exacerbated by further development in the village, but also by climate change. Any development should avoid reducing the size of the current playing field and no road should run through it.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1810	
4045	Mrs Charlotte Wyeld [20402]		VC BAR2, 1.20	VC BAR2, 4.20	Reduction of green space to incorporate new roads would mean destroying trees, bushes, killing off lots of wildlife which home in this area. Existing flooding issues are very bad already on playing field, can't take the amount of houses proposed.	Look at other areas of development.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1810	
4063	Ms Julie Bache [20359]		VC BAR2, 1.20	VC BAR2, 4.20	See previous answer for this site BAR2	See previous answer for this site BAR2	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1810	
4155	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		VC BAR2, 1.20	VC BAR2, 4.20	see previous answer for BAR2	see previous answer for BAR2	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1810	
3896	Mr Ian Irving (Barford/Wramplingham Village Hall Committee Member) [20471]		VC BAR2, 1.21	VC BAR2, 4.21	The village hall has 36 years left on a 99 year lease. The committee have, to date had no problems attracting funding when required. 36 years is a considerable time left remaining. The village hall is already held on a freehold basis to the community.	Acknowledge that the village hall is in good order and there are 36 years left remaining on the lease.	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1812	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3908	Barford & Wramplingham Parish Council (Barford and Wramplingham Parish Clerk) [12696]		VC BAR2, 1.21	VC BAR2, 4.21	The site specific allocation is not “sound” as defined in NPPF paragraph 35: it is neither positively prepared, justified, effective, nor consistent with national policy. The site is unlikely to be available within 5 years. There is a 99 year lease (36 years remaining) which requires (unlikely) agreement by the villagers and the Charity Commission before it is surrendered. The site assessment descriptions are inaccurate and out of date and therefore misleading.	Please comply with regulations specified above and ensure local knowledge is sought.	Appearance at Examination	Somebody from the Parish Council can bring local knowledge to bear.	Object	No	No	No	1812	BWPC VCHAP response Para 1.21.pdf - https://southnorfolkandbroadslandscapes.gov.uk/a/ss4
3915	Mr Nigel Ireson [20401]		VC BAR2, 1.21	VC BAR2, 4.21	The village hall has 36 years left on a 99 year lease. 36 years is a considerable time left remaining. The village hall is already held on a freehold basis to the community. Non-deliverability due to the above	No Changes would mitigate as the lease is not negotiable, due to strong feelings within the 2 villages	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1812	
3926	Miss Lisa Jordan [20465]		VC BAR2, 1.21	VC BAR2, 4.21	The site is located a long distance from many services such as shops and surgeries, secondary schools, and larger centres of employment. This makes the new development car and therefore carbon dependent. The land for the playing field is subject to 99 year lease dated 4 October 1961 with the registered charity “Barford Playing Field and Village Hall.” The land was leased to the charity with specific charitable purposes. The Trustees hold the lease “ The view of the village is that a vote in favour of surrender or disposal for currently considered plans is highly unlikely.	There should be no development on BAR2. See other sections.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1812	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3928	Mr Ian Irving (Barford/Wramplingham Village Hall Committee Member) [20471]		VC BAR2, 1.21	VC BAR2, 4.21	<p>Correction to text of Representation ID: 3896.</p> <p>The Barford and Wramplingham Village hall and Playing Field grounds have 36 years remaining on a 99 year lease. The committee have, to date, had no problems attracting funding when required. 36 years is a considerable time left remaining. The village hall building is already held on a freehold basis to the community.</p>	Use a different access point and minimise the loss of playing field space.	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1812	
3931	Mrs Rosanna Kellingray [20333]		VC BAR2, 1.21	VC BAR2, 4.21	<p>The villagers do not have any concerns about the village hall which has 36 years left on the lease. The villagers recently secured £70k to upgrade the play equipment, and would be very capable of raising sufficient funds to upgrade the village hall when and if needed.</p>	Remove following text, which is factually incorrect: it would benefit from upgrading and there are concerns that the length of time left on the land lease will make it increasingly difficult to secure the ongoing funding to maintain and improve the facility. As such,	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1812	
3948	Mrs Valerie Broomhead [16921]		VC BAR2, 1.21	VC BAR2, 4.21	<p>Should the proposed housing development take place a new village hall has to be delivered at the same time and not in the distant future.</p> <p>We understand, that in the past a nearby village struggled to have community facilities completed as the builders went into liquidation yet all the houses were completed.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1811	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4007	Su Waldron [15186]		VC BAR2, 1.21	VC BAR2, 4.21	<p>The village hall is in good order and there are many years left on the lease.</p> <p>The site allocation is not sound as set out in the NPPF paragraph 35. For example it will not deliver sustainable development</p> <p>The plan will spoil an important village amenity (the playing field) which is used for events, recreation, fetes etc. which are all of significance to the life of our villages.</p> <p>The new development would be car dependent as it is a long way from services, leading to increased vehicular traffic with all its concomittant problems.</p>	There should be no development on BAR2.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1812	
4031	Mrs Bridget Whittell [20337]		VC BAR2, 1.21	VC BAR2, 4.21	<p>The Village Hall is a much loved and well used resource in the community. Like any building constructed in the 1960s, it needs upgrading and repairing from time to time. It is in a good state of repair compared to many buildings of a similar age. With 36 years left on the land lease (the Village Hall itself is owned by the villagers), there is currently no problem in securing funding to ensure necessary improvements and repairs. It will require a majority vote by the villagers for the land lease to be relinquished.</p>	Current plan is not viable without the lease being relinquished. It could be argued that villagers are being bribed with the promise of a brand new, purpose built village hall. The landowner should consider gifting the playing field and the land on which the Village Hall and playground stands to the community, in its entirety, without it being tied as a condition to the VC BAR2 development. At the moment there is no guarantee that the land itself will be gifted to the community, just that a new village hall will be provided freehold to the community. We already own our village hall, but not the land on which it and the playing field/playground stands.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1812	
4048	Mrs Charlotte Wyeld [20402]		VC BAR2, 1.21	VC BAR2, 4.21	<p>The village hall is still fit for purpose and has had repairs within last few years. There's a substantial amount of time left on lease whereby fundraising could be achieved if repairs or upgrade is needed.</p>	No development at this site	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1812	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4064	Ms Julie Bache [20359]		VC BAR2, 1.21	VC BAR2, 4.21	A permanent freehold on the village hall could benefit the village when the lease expires in 60 year's time!		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1811	
4071	Ben Herring [20336]		VC BAR2, 1.21	VC BAR2, 4.21	<p>Misleading and inaccurate wording:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Village Hall (VH) is more than 'fit for purpose' providing an incredible resource for our village and better than many local villages - Do the 'concerns' have a factual basis? It is my understanding that there have been no such issues. - Use of emotive language e.g. 'heart of the village'. - 36 years remaining on lease - Curtailing the lease requires a majority vote from villagers AND charity commission scrutiny - Clear that the majority of opinion in village is against the development hence very unlikely the land would be available to develop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wording should be kept as neutral and factual e.g. remove 'to the heart of the village'. - At the very least there should be note to state the land is currently not available and very unlikely to be so due to clauses in the lease - VCBAR2 should not go forward with this knowledge, especially as this would represent potential land banking for the landowner and developer, to the detriment of the community 	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1812	
4086	Mrs Aleksandra Hyett [20293]		VC BAR2, 1.21	VC BAR2, 4.21	The village hall is not only fit for purpose, but it is a well used hub for local people from many villages around Barford. The roof has been recently repaired and a grand for new kitchen has been secured. Locals are not concern about the future of the hall, they would fundraise if needed as we did when play areas was in need of replacing. Residents don't want a new hall, we place a lot more value on the rural character of Barford and nature (trees, hedges and animals who live in them)	remove VC BAR2 from the project	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1812	
4156	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		VC BAR2, 1.21	VC BAR2, 4.21	A permanent freehold on the village hall would benefit the village when the lease exiles in 60 years		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1811	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3895	Mr Colin Coupland [20469]		VC BAR2, 1.22	VC BAR2, 4.22	<p>Conflict with the Landscape Visual Appraisal, which states 'Development on the northern half of the site has the potential to have an impact upon the wider landscape...' and as mitigation recommends to 'Limit development on the northern half of the boundary...' whereas Policy VC BAR2 advocates 'for approximately 40 dwellings to the north of the bisecting tree line'.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal is based upon an assessment of 30 dwellings so is not valid.</p> <p>Cumulative Flood Risk</p> <p>Village Hall Lease remaining</p> <p>Unsustainable - insufficient public transport links and increased vehicle movements.</p>	Development to be limited to twenty dwellings within the area north of bisecting tree line and designed such that 'development creep' into neighbouring fields is not possible.	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	No	1813	
3909	Barford & Wramplingham Parish Council (Barford and Wramplingham Parish Clerk) [12696]		VC BAR2, 1.22	VC BAR2, 4.22	<p>The development will likely cause flooding (surface and foul water) downstream thereby contravening NPPF Clause 165; the plan fails the duty to cooperate by failure to engage with Anglian Water; the Sustainability Appraisal is inaccurate and probably misleading; the Site Assessment Document consideration of flood risk is misleading; the development will increase car dependency and is in contravention of NPPF Clause 89, the JCS and the Cycling Strategy for Norfolk; it will also reduce the current playing field considerably and is thus unsound.</p>	Please comply with regulations specified above and ensure local knowledge is sought.	Appearance at Examination	Somebody from the Parish Council can bring local knowledge to bear.	Object	No	No	No	1868	<p>BWPC VCHAP response Para 1.22.pdf - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.ox2.uk/a/ss5</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3916	Mr Nigel Ireson [20401]		VC BAR2, 1.22	VC BAR2, 4.22	<p>The site is not well located - Poor local services, school is already at capacity</p> <p>Historic and still current regular flooding issues</p> <p>Long lease still on existing well maintained village hall</p> <p>A road would be required to access the proposed dwellings, so will reduce the current car parking space, the proposed development will add to road safety concerns</p>	Not viable due to negative impact on all aspects of village life	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1813	
3932	Mrs Rosanna Kellingray [20333]		VC BAR2, 1.22	VC BAR2, 4.22	<p>The site is not well located in terms of townscape. Barford is a rural village with the playing field at the centre of the village. Building a road and car park over the playing field would damage the landscape of the village.</p> <p>The proposal will not improve the playing field, but significantly reduce its value in terms of size and safety due to having a road through it. Building more houses and reducing amenity land for the people to use is absoluteley nonsensical.</p> <p>There is only one service in Barford - a school.</p>	<p>Remove the sentence as the townscape will be damaged and there is only one service (the school): The site is well located within Barford in terms of townscape and relationship to services.</p> <p>Remove the following wording which is untrue as the playing field would be significantly worsened (almost halved in size): improve the existing playing pitch</p>	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1813	
3949	Mrs Valerie Broomhead [16921]		VC BAR2, 1.22	VC BAR2, 4.22	<p>The site is not well located. Already the parking issues on Chapel Street are bedlam, and potentially dangerous at school drop off and collection times.</p> <p>How can you retain the parking as the proposed site is developed when already the street is congested. Residents on this road put up with enough already.</p>	Can you say, should this go ahead, where the holding area would be for the entire work force.	Appearance at Examination	See previous response.	Object	No	No	No	1813	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3968	Miss Lisa Jordan [20465]		VC BAR2, 1.22	VC BAR2, 4.22	<p>The site is not well located to services and would mean increased car dependency and therefore carbon dependant. 45 new homes could mean 90 extra cars in a village which has very narrow roads suitable for the width of one car. Increased vehicles onto Cock St and the junction of B1108 would be irresponsible on an already dangerous entrance to the village.</p> <p>Flooding and sewage pollution is already a problem in the village which would only be exacerbated by runoff from the new site.</p> <p>A reduced playing field is not a beneficial amenity.</p>	Not viable	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1813	
4026	Mr Malcolm Robertshaw [20489]		VC BAR2, 1.22	VC BAR2, 4.22	The proposals raise the question of where the extra medical and dental facilities required for 45 households will be found, existing local facilities already being stretched. Equally any increase in households will result in increased demand upon energy supplies to the village, which already suffers from numerous power outages and power cuts.	More n.h.s dentists would be nice!	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1813	
4040	Ms Emily Nolan [20493]		VC BAR2, 1.22	VC BAR2, 4.22	Increasing the number of cars in the village will only make the school pick up and drop off more dangerous.	This development should not go ahead.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1813	
4051	Mrs Charlotte Wyeld [20402]		VC BAR2, 1.22	VC BAR2, 4.22	Not a good location, would provide an increase in traffic nearby a primary school whereby school pick up and drop off times are already very busy. Unsafe to consider adding volumes of more traffic.	Consider other areas to develop	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1813	
4065	Ms Julie Bache [20359]		VC BAR2, 1.22	VC BAR2, 4.22	45 (not 40!) houses on a field which regularly floods is both unsound and unviable.	Allocation should be removed or revised to become a 'small' allocation. Even 40 houses in a village of 300 is too many.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1813	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4072	Ben Herring [20336]		VC BAR2, 1.22	VC BAR2, 4.22	<p>- Roads - Poor roads from all directions, unable to take more traffic</p> <p>- Junctions - dangerous, blind junctions at B1108 and Cock Street/Chapel Street, which are unchangeable and the main access to the proposed site</p> <p>- Vague parking requirements - needs to be adequate restrictions to allow for school pick up/drop off and stopping residents using as 'extra parking'</p> <p>- Developing on open countryside - against the Councils 'green' targets</p> <p>- Inadequate wildlife assessment</p> <p>- Council ignoring its own landscape visual assessment - talks about limiting development to north of site but has increased to 40 houses from 30</p>	<p>- Proper, in person assessment of the road system/junctions</p> <p>- Clearly defined wording on the restriction of parking for village hall and school use, to ensure the developers don't use it as extra parking</p> <p>- In person wildlife assessment</p> <p>- Ultimately, the VCBAR2 site should not move forward as it is not viable</p>	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1813	
4087	Mrs Aleksandra Hyett [20293]		VC BAR2, 1.22	VC BAR2, 4.22	<p>I strongly disagree that this development would ever improve the playing pitch. The recent plans shared by the developer shown the loss of app 30-40% of the playing pitch. Also having a road cutting thought the playing pitch would introduce serious safety concerns for the users (including children, dogs) and cars. Far smaller playing field with many additional users cannot be considered improvements by any reasonable person.</p> <p>This is not a good location and it would overwhelm the village inc introduce significantly more road traffic into the heart of a small semi rural village.</p>	remove VC BAR 2 from the project	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1813	
4157	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		VC BAR2, 1.22	VC BAR2, 4.22	<p>The new number of 45, over the original 40 homes on the site which regularly floods is unviable and unsound</p>	Allocation should be removed or revised to smaller allocation. Even 40 new homes in a village of 300 is far too many	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1813	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3918	Mr Nigel Ireson [20401]		VC BAR2, 1.23	VC BAR2, 4.23	Maintaining continuity of current facilities throughout construction would not be possible as the access road width to the proposed development would be through the current facilities. - reducing current parking provision and access to the playing field and village hall	No changes would mitigate the above	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1815	
3950	Mrs Valerie Broomhead [16921]		VC BAR2, 1.23	VC BAR2, 4.23	The village hall and playing fields are central to village life and well used by the community. This access must not be compromised.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1814	
4073	Ben Herring [20336]		VC BAR2, 1.23	VC BAR2, 4.23	- The current proposed access site would mean construction traffic moving very close to the village hall, field and play park. This poses significant risk to young children etc. - There would also be an active construction site within close proximity of several elements where continuity is proposed to be given which poses further risk. - What will happen if continuity is not able to be supplied?	#NAME?	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1815	
3897	Mr Ian Irving (Barford/Wramplingham Village Hall Committee Member) [20471]		VC BAR2, 1.24	VC BAR2, 4.24	Utilising the existing access to the village hall will mean a new road running immediately alongside the entrance to the children's playground, creating an unacceptable danger to young children. The early termination of the village hall lease, which this development would necessitate, would depend upon a majority vote of the residents in the 'area of benefit' and permission of the Charities Commission. This condition alone is likely to stop an early termination of the lease.	Change the location of the entrance onto the site.	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1817	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3917	Mr Nigel Ireson [20401]		VC BAR2, 1.24	VC BAR2, 4.24	Utilising the existing access to the village hall will mean a new road running immediately alongside the entrance to the children's playground, this will create an unacceptable danger to all users.	No changes would mitigate the above	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1817	
3919	Mr Nigel Ireson [20401]		VC BAR2, 1.24	VC BAR2, 4.24	Ditto my response to 1.23	No changes will mitigate this issue	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1817	
3933	Mrs Rosanna Kellingray [20333]		VC BAR2, 1.24	VC BAR2, 4.24	The significant increase in traffic turning in from Watton Road on to Cock Street, and using Cock Street would be very dangerous. This is because Cock Street is a narrow residential road with poor visibility with cars parked along the roadside, restricted visibility from houses pulling out and a foot path on only one side which children have to cross the road to get to. Only a few weeks ago someone was knocked from their bicycle. If the development were to go ahead, there would likely be much more serious incidents. Watton Road/ Cock Street is also a blind junction.	Recognise and describe the significant increase in traffic volume from the development and the dangerous impacts on pedestrians and cars using Cock Street.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1817	Cock Street is not suitable for such a significant increase in traffic 1.jpg - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ss9 Cock Street is not suitable for such a significant increase in traffic 3.jpg - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s4t3 pulling out blind on to cock street 1.jpg - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s44
3951	Mrs Valerie Broomhead [16921]		VC BAR2, 1.24	VC BAR2, 4.24	How is the narrow access on Chapel Street going to accommodate a 2.0 metre wide footway. Where is this going to come from? There needs to be a plan to scale published.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1816	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3969	Miss Lisa Jordan [20465]		VC BAR2, 1.24	VC BAR2, 4.24	<p>Using the current entrance to the village hall as entrance to the development would be dangerous not only as it would be alongside the children's play park but also the playingfield.</p> <p>Traffic exiting the site would merge onto Chapel St, then Cock St already busy rds during school runs. Cars park alongside these roads throughout the day which make them a single width road and very hazardous to navigate presently without a potential 90 cars leaving the development site.</p> <p>The village already has a vehicle speeding issue and pathways are limited.</p>	Not viable	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1817	
4054	Mrs Charlotte Wyeld [20402]		VC BAR2, 1.24	VC BAR2, 4.24	It would be such a busy junction with a huge volume of traffic, a big worry for parents of children who attend the school and villagers who like to walk this part of the road regularly and added pollution to the village	Look at other areas to develop	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1817	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4074	Ben Herring [20336]		VC BAR2, 1.24	VC BAR2, 4.24	<p>The existing access will be poorly positioned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Close to the junction with cock street which has a blind view with church street (west) and so will lead to accidents - The access poses a safety risk to children - The road leading from the access would break the relationship of village hall/field and park. - The access point would mean a road going through the southern element of the development, (based on road sizes) reducing the community services size by up to 25-30%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reject the VCBAR2 site as it is not viable for several reasons, this being one. If this is not seen as the case then: - Use different site access (I am not aware of anywhere suitable) - Proper, in person assessment of the local road system and junctions etc. - Restrict the road to the edge of the site and clearly define the safety infrastructure which the developers must employ - The developer/landowner to provide compensatory land from the site north of the tree line, that is the same size taken by the access road, to the villagers as part of the freehold agreement. This will ensure that the community space is not diminished. 	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1817	
3920	Mr Nigel Ireson [20401]		VC BAR2, 1.25	VC BAR2, 4.25	<p>The proposed development will not enhance the surrounding countryside at all, it will spoil the wider landscape from the valley / Colton</p> <p>The existing tree belts and hedges are historic and support local wildlife species especially bats</p>	No changes will mitigate this issue	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1819	
3934	Mrs Rosanna Kellingray [20333]		VC BAR2, 1.25	VC BAR2, 4.25	The existing playing field is bordered on all sides by dense hedgerows on Biodiversity Action Plan quality habitat, and ancient trees including Oaks which warrant TPO status. All of these hedgerows and trees should be maintained as are to preserve as much biodiversity at the site as possible.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1818	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3952	Mrs Valerie Broomhead [16921]		VC BAR2, 1.25	VC BAR2, 4.25	Will there be any form of wildlife survey of the tree belt to prevent habitat disruption.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1818	
3956	Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Sarah Eglington, Planning and Advocacy Advisor) [20410]		VC BAR2, 1.25	VC BAR2, 4.25	We are pleased to note that this policy includes a specification for the retention, protection and enhancement of the existing tree line.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1818	
3964	Mr Ian Doble [20480]		VC BAR2, 1.25	VC BAR2, 4.25	The area in question is prime hunting ground for the local breeding barn owls, so will have a significant negative impact on the local fauna and flora.	It should be abolished	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	No	1819	
3970	Miss Lisa Jordan [20465]		VC BAR2, 1.25	VC BAR2, 4.25	<p>The loss of any trees or vegetation to accommodate this site would not only be visually damaging but more importantly a loss of habitat to many species.</p> <p>As noted previously there is no record of a wildlife species survey being completed to protect our wildlife.</p>	A wildlife species survey being completed on site	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1819	
4042	Ms Emily Nolan [20493]		VC BAR2, 1.25	VC BAR2, 4.25	It is very important to protect the land as much as possible.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1818	
4075	Ben Herring [20336]		VC BAR2, 1.25	VC BAR2, 4.25	<p>The wildlife assessment here does not go far enough. This is used by a vast amount of wildlife e.g. Barn Owls, Bats etc., but the full extent of this has not been reviewed in a formal manner. We do not know whether there are any protected species here, e.g. crested newts in the pond to the north west of the site.</p> <p>There are old and important trees within the site, which have not been properly assessed and risk being removed by the development.</p>	<p>- A full, in person wildlife assessment</p> <p>- An in person assessment of the trees/bushes to ensure that important individuals are not removed</p> <p>- More clearly defined restrictions on what can and can't be removed and what enhancement is required - the current wording is too vague which gives the developers too open a scope</p> <p>- Penalties for the developer, should they not comply with the more clearly defined restrictions</p>	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1819	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4088	Mrs Aleksandra Hyett [20293]		VC BAR2, 1.25	VC BAR2, 4.25	<p>I am supportive of this paragraph that the tree belt and hedges need to be maintained, however, I object to this development. It's difficult to know what option to chose, which is evident from other responses..</p> <p>I object on the grounds of soundness, I don't believe that this precious habitat can be protected from the development which need access for the heavy machines, materials and eventually residents. Wherever this access is located, mature trees and hedges will have to be removed, together with many different species of animals.</p> <p>Access to carpark and play area would be affected during development.</p>	removed VC BAR 2 from project	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1819	
3871	Mrs Mary Dorrell [15168]		VC BAR2, 1.26	VC BAR2, 4.26	<p>The Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme is dependent on downstream maintenance of a network of privately owned surface water ditches that lead to the River Tiffey. These are largely not accessible to machinery and have to be hand dug/cleared Some owners do not understand their legal responsibilities to do so. Therefore the network may be operating at well below capacity even with the existing number of houses, road layout etc.</p> <p>Barford is one of approximately 20 villages in Norfolk who's sewage flooding issues are still being investigated by Anglia Water's Complex Investigation and Resolution Team.</p>	Please examine how surface water gets into the River Tiffey, here at its confluence with the River Yare. Improve the separation of surface water and foul water drainage. Increase the capacity for foul water drainage (currently still flooding gardens and threatening ingress to houses once again)	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	No	1820	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3921	Mr Nigel Ireson [20401]		VC BAR2, 1.26	VC BAR2, 4.26	<p>Historic and current serious flooding issues - Barford is one of approximately 20 villages in Norfolk who's sewage flooding issues are still being investigated by Anglia Water's Complex Investigation and Resolution Team.</p> <p>Anglian Water need to acknowledge a serious problem exists</p>	Current flooding problems need to resolved and also enhanced to provide enough capacity before any further development could possibly be considered	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1820	
3953	Mrs Valerie Broomhead [16921]		VC BAR2, 1.26	VC BAR2, 4.26	<p>Flooding and drainage issues have been ongoing for decades in the village. Housing, driveways and manicured gardens are not conducive to absorbing run-off. More pressure on the existing drains and gulleys once that field has been developed would be a disaster for the properties down from the village hall. Long term who would be responsible for flooding issues caused by this proposal.</p> <p>Drainage needs to go Northwards from the planned site.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1821	
3965	Mr Ian Doble [20480]		VC BAR2, 1.26	VC BAR2, 4.26	We have lived just to the east of the suggested proposal since 1989. There is a ditch along the western side of our property belonging to our neighbours. For the very first time in February this year the ditch filled with water and overflowed into the gardens of Clarks Close, as this development has blocked the ditch. Any further development on the high land to the north of Barford will just create more flooding problems.	Abolish the plan	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	No	1820	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3971	Miss Lisa Jordan [20465]		VC BAR2, 1.26	VC BAR2, 4.26	<p>Flooding is already an issue for the residents of Barford and during heavy rain sewage comes up in the road. Increasing the housing by up to 30 % will increase the frequency by which the system is overwhelmed.</p> <p>The study that has been done is limited to Dry Water Flow only not storm water flow which must also be given consideration.</p> <p>The current Barford Flood Alleviation Scheme is dependant on privately owned ditches being dug out by hand by owners and some do not realise their responsibilities. The scheme is not working with the current houses</p>	Anglian water need to do a thorough assessment to include discussions with residents who have current issues with flooding and sewage	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1820	
4025	Mr Malcolm Robertshaw [20489]		VC BAR2, 1.26	VC BAR2, 4.26	<p>Flooding occurs in the area adjacent to the site when there is rainfall, flowing into Chapel Street via a private garden, taking detritus with it as it flows in the direction of Marlingford. I understand that a procedure called “sustainable urban drainage system” can be operated in such circumstances. Is there any plan for such a scheme to be implemented in this case?. The sewage system is already infiltrated by the run off water.</p>	I have not seen the report (if there is one yet) by Anglian Water, so cannot comment on any changes	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	No	1820	
4041	Ms Emily Nolan [20493]		VC BAR2, 1.26	VC BAR2, 4.26	<p>This is very concerning not only for the houses in the village that already have trouble with flooding but also the houses that are proposed. It will be increasingly difficult for people to insure their homes for reasonable prices. I think it's pretty common knowledge that paving over land increases the rate of flooding. In a increasingly unpredictable climate building over a water-flow path feels like folly.</p>	I would like to see a guarantee that the houses affected by increased flooding will receive compensation from the developers and the council.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1820	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4066	Ms Julie Bache [20359]		VC BAR2, 1.26	VC BAR2, 4.26	Where else is the flood water going to go once the field is developed? This has not been researched, nor any advice provided. This cannot be left to chance, thereby putting the rest of the village at (even great) risk of flooding to their properties.	A comprehensive flood risk assessment should be undertaken before this proposal is considered any further.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1820	
4076	Ben Herring [20336]		VC BAR2, 1.26	VC BAR2, 4.26	<p>- I completely agree with representation on this subject by the Parish Council.</p> <p>- The surface water flooding situation in the village has not been assessed in person and only takes into account the dry flow</p> <p>- Ongoing issues in the village, including in 2024, mainly rising from the proposed VCBAR2 site</p> <p>- Barford is still being investigated by Anglia Water's Complex Investigation and Resolution Team</p> <p>- Insufficient capacity (Barford Water Recycling Centre)</p> <p>- Anglian Water is not a prescribed body</p> <p>- There are no clearly defined duties placed on the developer</p> <p>- There is no indemnity for the villagers</p>	<p>- Proper in person assessment by an independent body on the surface water issues on VCBAR2, providing clear instruction on whether the site is viable or not</p> <p>- Proper understanding of the sewage issues before embarking on further development</p> <p>- More clearly defined duties for the developer, rather than 'explore opportunities'</p> <p>- Clear and proper indemnity supplied for those houses currently in the village, should there be flooding impact off the back of the development, which should be supplied by the developers/landowners</p>	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1820	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4094	Mr Andrew Ince-Jones [20497]		VC BAR2, 1.26	VC BAR2, 4.26	<p>The plan overstates local employment opportunity and refers to a pub which has not functioned for over ten years. It refers to a run down village hall, untrue as it is well maintained and sound.</p> <p>The proposed bar2 site is waterlogged every winter with properties adjacent to the existing playing field already having to sandbag their perimeters. Barford exists on a flood plain with saturation noticeably worsening year on year, we would not wish the inevitable consequences of flooding on residents of the village.</p> <p>This proposal reduces amenity and puts a road adjacent to a football pitch?</p>	Whilst Barford would undoubtedly benefit from new housing, unfortunately it sits on a floodplain and lacks amenities resulting in a poor carbon footprint for residents. The village should be removed from future larger scale planning considerations.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	Yes	1820	
4158	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		VC BAR2, 1.26	VC BAR2, 4.26	The development on the village hall site would increase flood risk for existing residents of Barford	A comprehensive flood risk assessment should be undertaken before this proposal goes any further	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1820	
3954	Mrs Valerie Broomhead [16921]		VC BAR2, 1.27	VC BAR2, 4.27	Current properties must be protected.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1822	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4077	Ben Herring [20336]		VC BAR2, 1.27	VC BAR2, 4.27	<p>The curtilage of School Farmhouse, and the associated agricultural building which are historically associated with it, extends beyond the bisecting tree belt. Due to this, the talk of developing houses to the north of the tree line would not retain a more open, agricultural feel, as there would be houses immediately adjacent to it.</p> <p>The current assessment does not take into account the views from/around the property, which would not be maintained as 'open and agricultural' as described in the wording of paragraph 1.27.</p>	<p>VBAR2 should be rejected as a site as it is not viable</p> <p>Should this not be agreed, then:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proper engagement with Historic England to assess the site, rather than desk based assessment - Restrict the development further as to include leaving the south east corner of the field to the north of the tree line (proposed area for houses) clear, to ensure the open, agricultural feel. - Further enhancement of the tree line both east/west and north/south on the easterly border of the development 	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1823	
4084	Hannah Pintilie [20364]		VC BAR2, 1.27	VC BAR2, 4.27	Any development within the area of the proposal WILL be visible from School Farmhouse and it's associated buildings including the Hay Barn, therefore negatively impacting on the open agricultural feel.	The plan should be moved outside the vicinity of such buildings of historical significance.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1823	
3955	Mrs Valerie Broomhead [16921]		VC BAR2, 1.28	VC BAR2, 4.28	<p>Clearly previous comments by many have been ignored.</p> <p>The village does not have the road system to cope with further development so close to the school without creating additional hazards and much more traffic.</p> <p>See all previous comments - light pollution, drainage, risk of flooding and so forth.</p>	Get rid of it.	Appearance at Examination	<p>To have a proper idea as to what is planned.</p> <p>The convoluted system is not user friendly.</p>	Object	No	No	No	1824	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3972	Miss Lisa Jordan [20465]		VC BAR2, 1.28	VC BAR2, 4.28	<p>The playing field area will in fact not be improved as it will be reduced by up to 40%.</p> <p>The site will be car and therefore carbon dependant which is contrary to planning policies.</p> <p>An increase of up to 90 cars in the villages country roads presents issues of safety when leaving the site onto Chapel St and Cock St. Navigating the existing parked cars out onto the B1108 is already a hazard for residents.</p> <p>Current flooding issues that effect many residents will be exacerbated by an increase of 30% of dwellings in the village.</p>	Not viable	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1825	
3910	Barford & Wramplingham Parish Council (Barford and Wramplingham Parish Clerk) [12696]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>The site-specific allocation is not “sound” as defined in NPPF paragraph 35: it is neither positively prepared, justified, effective, nor consistent with national policy. The site is unlikely to be available within 5 years. There is a 99-year lease (36 years remaining) which requires (unlikely) agreement by the villagers and the Charity Commission before it is surrendered. The development will increase car dependency, will reduce the current playing field considerably, and is likely to exacerbate current drainage problems (surface and foul water) and flood risk.</p>	Please comply with the regulations specified above, and ensure local knowledge is sought.	Appearance at Examination	Somebody from the Parish Council can bring local knowledge to bear.	Object	No	No	No	1827	BWPC VCHAP response VCBAR2 policy.pdf - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ss6

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3935	Mrs Rosanna Kellingray [20333]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>This application is flawed due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Irreplaceable loss of community amenity space - A road bisecting the community amenity space making it dangerous for children - Highways issues due to significant increase in traffic on surrounding minor roads - Environmental impacts <p>The village hall committee who own the lease of the playing field, have confirmed that in order for the development to take place they would have to give up the lease. This can only be done with the majority vote of residents at a community meeting. The site may therefore not even be available for development.</p>	<p>'Enhancement of the existing playing field' should be replaced with 'maintain the size of the existing playing field site and facilities including cricket pitch'.</p> <p>'Access using the existing village hall entrance, subject to provision of acceptable visibility splays;' it should be clarified that the main access road must not run between the village hall and the play area, as this makes the site extremely dangerous for people, especially children, moving between the two areas.</p> <p>'The developer of the site will also undertake to work with the Highway Authority to promote an appropriate 20mph speed limit via the Traffic Regulation Order process.' it should be clarified that this applies to Chapel Street and Cock Street and that the Watton Road / Cock Street junction must be made safe to deal with the increased volume of traffic.</p>	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1827	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3937	NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (Mr Thomas Clare, ICS Estates Planning Liaison and Policy Lead) [20478]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>Proposed sites in Barford and Swardeston will increase pressure on already constrained GP practices in Hethersett and Mulbarton, these Practices are part of the Humbleyard GP practice group. There are discussions currently ongoing between the Council and GP practices regarding mitigation for the amount of population growth these areas have already seen and that will be happening in the near future.</p> <p>The ambulance service, EEAST, are in a unique position that intersects health, transport and community safety and does not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development combined with other developments in the vicinity. This development is likely to increase demand upon existing constrained ambulance services and nationally set blue light response times. The capital required through developer contribution would form a proportion of the required funding for the provision of capacity to absorb the patient growth and demand generated by this development. Any funding would be used towards the capital cost of providing new additional ambulances and/or new additional medical equipment, which for an ambulance service is their physical infrastructure, and/or new additional parking space(s) for ambulances at existing ambulance stations.</p>	None specified. ICB encourages continued working with the LPA.	Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1869	NHS ICS Response - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3g
3957	Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Sarah Eglington, Planning and Advocacy Advisor) [20410]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	We support the text in this policy which specifies the retention, protection and enhancement of the existing tree line.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1826	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3986	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19732]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there is a grade II listed building, School Farmhouse, to the south east of the site. The development has the potential to impact the significance of this heritage asset via a change in its setting.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the revised Heritage Impact Assessment for the site. In particular we note that built development will now be limited to the northern part of the site with the southern area being retained as playing field, play area and village hall. This is reflected in the policy wording and supporting text of the Plan. This revised site layout will help to protect the setting of the farmhouse by providing breathing space around the asset.</p> <p>There is still no criterion in relation to archaeology in the policy. As previously advised there should also be a requirement for archaeological desk-based assessment to inform any planning application and investigation prior to commencement of development.</p>	Add criterion in relation to archaeology.	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1831	<p>Historic England Representation Letter - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssx</p> <p>Historic England Representation Table - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssj</p>
4005	Dr Keith Waldron [15165]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>I agree with the objections made by Barford and Wramplingham Parish Council (for all their representations).</p> <p>I also wish to express my concern that this consultation process is overly complicated and probably puts off many potential respondents.</p>	Please address the concerns raised by Barford and Wramplingham Parish Council.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1827	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
<u>4011</u>	Mrs Paula Aspland [20328]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>Support Parish Councils response to VC BAR2</p> <p>Land is not available and would require Charity Commission and residents to surrender lease.</p> <p>Huge impact on environment with loss of established trees and reduced green space.</p> <p>Field is unusable in winter and spring due to water logging. Developers unlikely to be able to resolve this.</p> <p>Scheme is not sound and does not meet duty to cooperate, particularly relating to flooding and Anglian Water.</p> <p>Scheme will rip out heart of village.</p>	Object to allocation.	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1827	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4013	Mrs Emma Macconnachie [20335]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>Support Parish Councils response to VC BAR2</p> <p>Land is not available and would require Charity Commission and residents to surrender lease.</p> <p>Huge impact on environment with loss of established trees and reduced green space.</p> <p>Safety of children on school bus a concern due to heavy traffic and construction period.</p> <p>Scheme is not sound and does not meet duty to cooperate, particularly relating to flooding and Anglian Water.</p>	Object to allocation.	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1827	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4036	M.C.R (Barford Resident) [20490]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>Express concerns for 45 new homes in Barford,</p> <p>Flooding occurs in adjacent area when there is rainfall, flowing on Chapel Street, blocking drains and flowing towards Marlingford.</p> <p>Will increase traffic flow and increase danger for children especially in play area.</p> <p>Existing playing field will be significantly restricted when it is constantly used.</p> <p>Any plan to use SuDS on site?</p> <p>Will represent a 30% increase in size of village.</p> <p>Sewerage system already overwhelmed and this will only add to it.</p> <p>Where will extra doctors and dentists come from when existing services are already stretched.</p>	None specified.	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1827	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4043	Mr David Cartwright [20494]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Site prone to flooding from surface water, which will be exacerbated by any development. The loss of amenity to the community would be very significant and the proposed replacements do not provide equivalent facilities. Barford does not have facilities such as shops, GPs or much employment, meaning new residents will be vehicle-dependent. The village cannot support another c. 80 cars. Another area has already been agreed for development in Barford, at the cost of village facilities; this proposal would further damage a small community.	The overall plan includes more development than required and Barford has already taken a share of the pain. Recommend removing VC BAR2 for the stated reasons. The overall targets can be achieved without this site.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1827	
4056	Mrs Charlotte Wyeld [20402]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>I object due to following reasons</p> <p>Loss of green space and well used area by villagers and other communities.</p> <p>Highways issues - volumes of increased traffic - road safety</p> <p>Lease can only be given up by majority vote, so site may not be available for development.</p>	Object, look at other sites to develop	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1827	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4080	Ben Herring [20336]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>- I completely support the representations of the Parish Council throughout this consultation and they should be read and taken heed of by the planning inspectorate, as a priority.</p> <p>The majority of the points I have addressed via the relevant paragraph above. In addition to this:</p> <p>- The village hall should be better than the existing hall, not equal to it otherwise there is no advantage to the community</p> <p>- The developer should also be required to adequately finish and furnish the hall, to a useable level.</p>	<p>VCBAR2 should be rejected as a site as it has multiple flaws, is not legal, sound nor compliant.</p> <p>Should, for whatever reason, this site is seen to be appropriate to move forward, (as mentioned in previous paragraphs) in short summary:</p> <p>- Change wording to ensure the function is better than the existing hall, with contractual agreement between the landowner/developer and the Village Hall committee to ensure it is properly delivered</p> <p>- SAFE continuity of services of a function at least equal to that currently afforded to the village</p> <p>- Enhancement AND NO REDUCTION IN FUNCTIONAL SIZE of the existing playing field</p> <p>- Thorough assessment and intervention in the existing flooding and drainage issues with clearly defined duties and appropriate indemnity for the existing houses in the village</p> <p>- Assessment and safeguarding of the flora and fauna of the village which will be affected</p> <p>- Proper assessment of roads/junctions and seek alternative access</p>	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1827	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4081	Hannah Pintilie [20364]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Impact on village and lack of amenities within the village * Increase in traffic and junctions * Loss of part of playing fields * Barford school growing and high schools oversubscribed locally * No assessment of potential impact on wildlife within the area * Lack of parking for school pick up/drop off * Impact on historic buildings * Flooding risk 	The plan should be rejected for the above reasons.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1827	
4090	Mr steve hyett [19380]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>Significant increase in traffic through the village.</p> <p>Likely increase flood risk</p> <p>Diminished playing field by up to 40%</p> <p>The site is under lease for another 36 years and not available unless the villagers agree to release the lease.</p> <p>Inaccuracy in the vchap consultation</p> <p>Increase of stress on local services in neighbouring villages eg doctors</p> <p>Destruction of green space which is bad for environment</p>	Remove plans from consultation	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1827	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4091	Mrs Aleksandra Hyett [20293]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>proposal not sound</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - developers don't have rights to south site, up to residents to agree in public vote - confirmed by Village Hall Committee Sept 2024. Nearly 90 residents signed objection which shows how community feels. - loss of mature hedges and trees and many living creatures with them - increased traffic on small rural roads - loss of playing pitch up to 40% to allow access to development - safety concerns - access road through playing pitch (children, dogs, cars) - increased flooding - destroyed semi-rural character and open countryside views at the heart - creating us/them divide 	remove BAR2 from the project	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1827	
4093	Mr Paul Dick [20278]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>We agree with the response by Barford and Wramplingham Parish Council dated 17/9/2024 and as such we object to the proposal VCBAR2, repetition of those comments here is unnecessary.</p> <p>We are also concerned that the proposed development would increase traffic flow along Church Street which is unlit and has no pavements - it is already a real risk to pedestrians even in daylight and this development would only serve to increase that risk</p>	Either scrap the plan entirely OR a much reduced development with a different access	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1827	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4095	Mrs Beth Prakash [20400]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>traffic concerns particularly for children.</p> <p>reduction in use of the village hall and playing field, and safety between the two</p> <p>reduction in green space central to the village and its impact on use and the mental health wellbeing of old and young alike who use it for ease of accessibility, size, diversity in trees and ability to get to a quiet corner</p>	I strongly believe it should be moved to the edge of the village, not central. The central nature is what raises all my concerns	Written Representation		Object	Yes	Yes	No	1827	
4110	Water Management Alliance (Ms Phillipa Nanson, Sustainable Development Officer) [20327]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Major development - If surface water discharges within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD, we request that this discharge is facilitated in line with the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1833	Water Management Alliance - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stx

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4123	Rainier Developments and Strategic Land [20498]	Ceres Property (Mr Sam Hollingworth, Associate Partner) [20500]	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>Looking first at VC BAR2, Land at Chapel Street, Barford we note that the Parish Council has raised what appear to be significant concerns regarding the development of this potential allocation. In its response (representation ID 3910) to the Regulation 19 Addendum, the Council states:</p> <p>“The site is unlikely to be available within 5 years. There is a 99-year lease (36 years remaining) which requires (unlikely) agreement by the villagers and the Charity Commission before it is surrendered.”</p> <p>On the basis of the above, this proposed allocation could not be considered deliverable as defined by the NPPF. Whilst the Parish Council refer to development of the site not being achievable within 5 years, based on the information they have provided it is difficult to see how it could be considered capable of coming forward during the plan period at all.</p>	Reasonable alternatives such as GNLP3033 clearly should have been considered. It is evidently a sustainable site for development. There is no evidence to suggest it is unsuitable.	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1829	<p>Rainier Developments - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stn</p> <p>Rainier Developments Vision - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3t</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
<u>4134</u>	Environment Agency (Alasdair Hain-Cole, Planning Officer) [20421]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>Current data shows limited capacity at Barford Water Recycling Centre (WRC). While there may be some room for limited growth, the proposed allocations and resulting increase in foul water flows pose the potential risk of harm to the waterbody receiving treated effluent from Barford WRC.</p> <p>We therefore recommend including within policies VC BAR1 and VC BAR2 the requirement for developers of the site to enter into early engagement with Anglian Water in order to demonstrate there is sufficient capacity in the network and receiving WRC to accommodate foul flows from the development.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1830	

4148	Sport England (Ms Clare Howe, Planning Manager) [20427]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>Sport England considers the policy to be inconsistent with paragraph 103 of the NPPF and our Playing Fields Policy. The policy needs to ensure that the access road and replacement village hall shall not result in the loss of, or prejudice the use of, playing field unless it meets one of the exceptions in Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and paragraph 103 of the NPPF. The policy needs to ensure the replacement village hall and associated infrastructure will accord with exception 4 of our Playing Fields Policy, as well as according with criteria b of paragraph 103 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>To address our concerns regarding the access road to the new housing and the new village hall, Sport England requests the submission of a masterplan is incorporated into the site-specific policy. This masterplan should demonstrate that the site allocation will not lead to a loss of, or prejudice the use of, the playing field. In the event the site allocation results in the loss of, or prejudices the use of, the playing field, it is suggested that a criterion be added to the policy, stating that if the development results in the loss of, or prejudices the use of, playing field, it must meet one or more of the five exceptions outlined in Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and paragraph 103 of the NPPF. Implementing either of these options or including just the additional criterion as a bullet point, should ensure any future development of the site to accord with Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and paragraph 103 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Incorporating a masterplan into the site-specific policy would provide clarity on whether the location of the new village hall and associated facilities such as car parking would result in the loss of, or prejudice the use of, the playing field. In the absence of a masterplan the wording of the policy should be revised to ensure the proposals consistent with criteria b of paragraph 103 of the NPPF and exception 4 of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy. The suggested wording below should ensure that the site</p>	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1835	Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan - Reg. 19 Pre-submission Addendum - Sport England's Comments.pdf - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s3s
----------------------	---	--	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	---	------------------------	--	--------	-----	----	-----	------	--

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
						<p>allocation would better align with the wording of exception 4 in Sport England's Playing Fields Policy, as well as criteria b of paragraph 103 of the NPPF. This is necessary, as stipulated in exception 4 of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy when evaluating the replacement of playing fields and associated facilities (please refer to paragraph 57 of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy) unless, at the time of submitting the planning application, there is an evidence base which supports the case that the playing field and/or ancillary facilities are surplus to current or future needs, thereby benefiting from exception 1 of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy. Sport England requests that the first bullet point is revised as set out below or to that affect.</p> <p>'Delivery of a new village hall, prior to the loss of the existing village hall, (remove: close to the existing playground of a function) of equal or better quality and equivalent or greater quantity than the existing hall, in a suitable location with sufficient parking which does not prejudice the use of the playing field, and constructed to the latest environmental standards, and provided freehold to the community;'</p>								
4159	Mr Joel Chant [20362]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	There have now been 45 new homes proposed not 40 as stated. This needs reviewing	Scrap the plans for BAR1 & BAR2	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1827	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4166	Rainier Developments and Strategic Land [20498]	Ceres Property (Mr Sam Hollingworth, Associate Partner) [20500]	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>Looking first at VC BAR2, Land at Chapel Street, Barford we note that the Parish Council has raised what appear to be significant concerns regarding the development of this potential allocation. In its response (representation ID 3910) to the Regulation 19 Addendum, the Council states:</p> <p>“The site is unlikely to be available within 5 years. There is a 99-year lease (36 years remaining) which requires (unlikely) agreement by the villagers and the Charity Commission before it is surrendered.”</p> <p>On the basis of the above, this proposed allocation could not be considered deliverable as defined by the NPPF. Whilst the Parish Council refer to development of the site not being achievable within 5 years, based on the information they have provided it is difficult to see how it could be considered capable of coming forward during the plan period at all.</p>	Reasonable alternatives such as GNLP0321 and GNLP1032 clearly should have been considered. It is evidently a sustainable site for development. There is no evidence to suggest it is unsuitable.	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1829	<p>Rainier and Octagon - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s34 Rainier and Octagon Appendix A - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s35 Rainier and Octagon Appendix B - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s36</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4171	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>The proposed additional site for 40 dwellings is within the catchment for Barford-Chapel Street Water Recycling Centre (WRC). Based on current data, whilst there is limited headroom based on dry weather flow at the WRC for future growth, there is currently capacity for the proposed growth (VC BAR1/BAR2). To take account of cumulative growth in the catchment, including additional dwellings that might arise through windfall developments, we would welcome the supporting text to encourage the developer to undertake early pre-planning engagement with Anglian Water to discuss network connections and network/WRC capacity.</p> <p>Anglian Water supports the requirement to alleviate flood risk given the site is identified at the head of a significant surface water flow path. The opportunities for providing overall betterment for the existing community should not be underestimated given the more frequent storms and intense rainfall experienced over the autumn and winter months (2023-24). Reducing surface water run-off can also help prevent ingress to our sewer networks and reduce the probability of surcharge events. Our experience over the winter of 2023-24 leading to the period between October 2022 and March 2024 was the wettest 18 months since records began - causing us to revise our expectations of the pace and scale at which climate change will impact our networks.</p>	The policy should be amended to require a flood and drainage strategy to be submitted for the site, which should be supported by a recent pre-planning engagement assessment from Anglian Water.	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1832	Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s3v

4187	Cllr Richard Elliott (SNC Councillor) [20442]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>Flooding</p> <p>Surface water flooding is a major concern and indeed discussion with stakeholders over mitigation in all these villages has been ongoing, in the case of Barford and Wicklewood for a considerable time.</p> <p>I want to ensure that in your deliberations the existing problems of surface water flooding and the potential for making things worse has been properly considered.</p> <p>Any doubts over the impact that further large scale development in these villages will have on surface water flooding should rule out these sites. In my opinion it is no coincidence that large scale development in North Wymondham has had an adverse effect on the River Tiffey, causing additional pressures downstream in Barford and Wrampingham.</p> <p>Scale, Density and Protecting the Rural Landscape</p> <p>I must stress that I am not in any way against some appropriate development in rural villages.</p> <p>However, increasing housing in a concentration of relatively small villages north of Wymondham over a relatively short time, will in my view have the potential to damage the rural character, important landscapes and nature of these communities. This is made more serious when the necessary infrastructure (health care, education, retail, transport) to support this growth either lags behind construction</p>		Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1827	
----------------------	---	--	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	--	---------------	--	--------	-----	----	-----	------	--

[illegible]

4189	Mrs Rosanna Kellingray [20333]		Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	Policy VC BAR2: Land at Chapel Street	<p>I am writing on behalf of a group of local residents who wish to make a formal objection to the proposal at site VCBAR2, Barford Village Hall and Playing Field.</p> <p>93 residents have signed a petition in support of the Barford and Wramplingham Parish Council's objection in response to the consultation. By signing, they agree in full with the contents of the Parish Council response.</p> <p>In collating and sending you this petition we are following the Representation Form Guidance Note section 4.3.</p> <p>The representation has been authorised via the gathering of signatory's names and addresses via email, a drop-in session at the village hall, and face-to-face discussion with local residents. Residents were asked to sign their names if they wish to support the Parish Council Representation, and were provided with a copy/ link to a copy of the representation to read in full.</p> <p>93 residents objecting to this development demonstrates the strength of feeling in the community. No doubt more signatures would have been given had more time been available.</p> <p>I would also like to bring to your attention p13 of the PC response which states that the playing field is currently under lease to Barford and Wramplingham Village Hall and Playing Field, a charity, and that a community vote in favour of surrender of the lease is required in order to</p>	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1827	Barford Flyer - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3b
----------------------	--------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	---------------	--	--------	----	----	----	------	---

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
					make the site available, which is highly unlikely.									
3863	Collins & Coward Limited (Mr Tony Collins, Managing Director) [19997]		Services and Community Facilities, 2.3	Services and Community Facilities, 6.3	At paragraph 2.3, the Council acknowledges that Bawburgh does not have a range of facilities and is not part of a village cluster. It is a village that stands in isolation from other villages in the district. It also accepts there is a severely limited bus service with just one bus to Wymondham and back three times per week (Monday, Wednesday, and Friday), when it does run. No evidence has been provided of an “on-demand service” for the village as claimed by the District Council.		Appearance at Examination	Previously stated wishes to attend	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1834	Tony Collins Representations - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/srm

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3872	Mrs Ruth Tait [20056]		Services and Community Facilities, 2.3	Services and Community Facilities, 6.3	<p>A weekly bus service is extremely misleading. At best there may be a single bus on one day in a week to Wymondham.</p> <p>"plus on -demand" is very misleading as there may not be a service available when it is needed. It would be more appropriate to include taxis (which are expensive as they will have to come from Norwich or Wymondham).</p>	<p>Replace "a weekly bus service" with "an extremely limited bus service" or "There may be a single bus on one day in a week to Wymondham".</p> <p>Remove "plus on-demand . . ."</p>	Written Representation		Object	No	No	Yes	1834	
3880	Dr Ian Tait [19969]		Services and Community Facilities, 2.3	Services and Community Facilities, 6.3	<p>Stating there is a weekly bus service is extremely misleading. At best there may be a single bus on one day in a week to Wymondham. "plus on -demand" is very misleading as there may not be a service available when it is needed. It would be more appropriate to include taxis (which are expensive as they will have to come from Norwich or Wymondham).</p>	Remove these references to buses and on demand.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	Yes	1834	
3889	Mrs Kathryn Cross (SNC ward member for Bawburgh) [20423]		Services and Community Facilities, 2.3	Services and Community Facilities, 6.3	<p>On demand services is misleading when there is no evidence of this, other than taxis. Locals report being unable to access any public transport when needed and have to rely on lifts from friends and family. One bus a week to Wymondham does not constitute an adequate public transport facility. Also lacks any safe walking or cycling routes to public transport hubs as no pavements to the top of Stocks Hill or on Long Lane.</p>	Remove 'on demand services' and include 'very limited public transport options' with 'need for residents to be vehicle owners'	Appearance at Examination	South Norfolk councillor representing Bawburgh	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1834	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4017	Bawburgh Parish Council [19210]	Collins & Coward Limited (Mr Tony Collins, Managing Director) [19997]	Services and Community Facilities, 2.3	Services and Community Facilities, 6.3	At paragraph 2.3, the Council acknowledges that Bawburgh does not have a range of facilities and is not part of a village cluster. It is a village that stands in isolation from other villages in the district. It also accepts there is a severely limited bus service with just one bus to Wymondham and back three times per week (Monday, Wednesday, and Friday), when it does run. No evidence has been provided of an “on-demand service” for the village as claimed by the District Council.		Appearance at Examination	Previously stated wishes to attend	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1834	Bawburgh Parish Council - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssq
3844	Gable Developments (Mr Ben Kemp) [19879]		VC BAW1REV, 2.5	VC BAW1REV, 6.5	As the land owner we support this revision so Crocus can take this forward to enable to deliver a foot stroke cycle linked to primary school should they require.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1836	
3864	Collins & Coward Limited (Mr Tony Collins, Managing Director) [19997]		VC BAW1REV, 2.5	VC BAW1REV, 6.5	At paragraph 2.5 there is a suggestion that a footpath link could be provided between the site and the primary school with a new rear entrance. Such an access is unlikely to be supported by the police on health & safety grounds given its location and remoteness. A new footpath would need to be lit during winter to ensure safety of pupils. There is no indication of how such a footpath would be maintained, with such a proposal most likely to be unacceptable to the residents’ management company for the site. Therefore, it would require either the landowner or highway authority to maintain – there does not seem to be evidence of any such consultation or commitment to such a path.		Appearance at Examination	Previously stated wishes to attend	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1837	Tony Collins Representations - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/srm
3873	Mrs Ruth Tait [20056]		VC BAW1REV, 2.5	VC BAW1REV, 6.5	The provision of a footpath is totally opportunistic. There must be a host of opportunities that may be possible.	Remove reference to the opportunistic footpath.	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1837	
3881	Dr Ian Tait [19969]		VC BAW1REV, 2.5	VC BAW1REV, 6.5	The mention of a provision of a footpath is totally opportunistic. There must be a host of opportunities that may be possible.	Remove reference to the footpath.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	Yes	1837	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3891	Mrs Kathryn Cross (SNC ward member for Bawburgh) [20423]		VC BAW1REV, 2.5	VC BAW1REV, 6.5	Second access footpath to the school is too vague as it does not give any idea who should maintain it. Plus unlikely to be much need for it for at least a decade as school is at capacity and any children moving into new development would have to go to school elsewhere unless entering in reception year which means many years until children in the new development can attend Bawburgh Primary. Plus when children leave primary there is no public transport to secondary school. Refute existing pedestrian connectivity from the site as can only safely access school and village hall	Remove reference to second footpath as irrelevant. Highway safety needs reviewing	Appearance at Examination	South Norfolk councillor representing Bawburgh	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1837	
4018	Bawburgh Parish Council [19210]	Collins & Coward Limited (Mr Tony Collins, Managing Director) [19997]	VC BAW1REV, 2.5	VC BAW1REV, 6.5	<p>At paragraph 2.5 there is a suggestion that a footpath link could be provided between the site and the primary school with a new rear entrance. Such an access is unlikely to be supported by the police on health & safety grounds given its location and remoteness. A new footpath would need to be lit during winter to ensure safety of pupils. There is no indication of how such a footpath would be maintained,</p> <p>with such a proposal most likely to be unacceptable to the residents' management company for the site. Therefore, it would require either the landowner or highway authority to maintain – there does not seem to be evidence of any such consultation or commitment to such a path.</p>		Appearance at Examination	Previously stated wishes to attend	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1837	Bawburgh Parish Council - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssq
3845	Gable Developments (Mr Ben Kemp) [19879]		VC BAW1REV, 2.11	VC BAW1REV, 6.11	As the land owner we support this revision so Crocus can take this forward to enable to deliver a larger site area to achieve lower density with high quality design and accentuate the view cone through the site in landscaping terms.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1838	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3865	Collins & Coward Limited (Mr Tony Collins, Managing Director) [19997]		VC BAW1REV, 2.11	VC BAW1REV, 6.11	At paragraph 2.11, the site is proposed to be increased from 1.4 hectares to 1.97 hectares (an increase of 41% to reflect a lower density in the village). The most recent development adjacent to the Village Hall was developed at 9 units per hectare and the new site is now promoted at 18 units per hectare – twice that previously approved. A development of 15 units could be achieved in the original 1.4 hectares at the previously approved density.		Appearance at Examination	Previously stated wishes to attend	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1839	Tony Collins Representations - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/sr/m
3874	Mrs Ruth Tait [20056]		VC BAW1REV, 2.11	VC BAW1REV, 6.11	<p>The village is small and isolated. It cannot be clustered with another village.</p> <p>The NPPF has been removed and so there are no targets and gaps to be filled by VCHAP.</p> <p>The development would contravene the SBLZ.</p>	Remove the village from the cluster plan.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	Yes	1872	
3882	Dr Ian Tait [19969]		VC BAW1REV, 2.11	VC BAW1REV, 6.11	As mentioned in previous representations, the village is small and isolated. It cannot be clustered with another village. The NPPF has been removed and so there are no targets and gaps to be filled by VCHAP. The development would contravene the SBLZ.	Remove the village from the cluster plan.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	Yes	1872	
3892	Mrs Kathryn Cross (SNC ward member for Bawburgh) [20423]		VC BAW1REV, 2.11	VC BAW1REV, 6.11	Loss of highest grade agricultural land is contrary to planning policy. Increasing the area means greater loss of land. If a scheme has to be accepted I agree with parish council that 15 dwellings would be an appropriate number on 1.4ha. More development area equals greater flood risk from water run off due to more tarmac and concrete and loss of habitats/productive agricultural land	Area of 1.4ha allocated for 15 dwellings	Appearance at Examination	South Norfolk councillor representing Bawburgh	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1839	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4019	Bawburgh Parish Council [19210]	Collins & Coward Limited (Mr Tony Collins, Managing Director) [19997]	VC BAW1REV, 2.11	VC BAW1REV, 6.11	At paragraph 2.11, the site is proposed to be increased from 1.4 hectares to 1.97 hectares (an increase of 41% to reflect a lower density in the village). The most recent development adjacent to the Village Hall was developed at 9 units per hectare and the new site is now promoted at 18 units per hectare – twice that previously approved. A development of 15 units could be achieved in the original 1.4 hectares at the previously approved density.		Appearance at Examination	Previously stated wishes to attend	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1839	Bawburgh Parish Council - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssq
3846	Gable Developments (Mr Ben Kemp) [19879]		Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	As the land owner we support this revision so Crocus can take this forward to enable to deliver these policy objectives whilst retaining existing trees and shrubs as far as practical.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1840	
3875	Mrs Ruth Tait [20056]		Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	<p>The village cannot accommodate 35 dwellings which would increase the size of the village by more than 15% which is too large.</p> <p>The density of housing would be twice that of recent developments, which are all bungalows and include social housing, and would be out of character with the rest of the village.</p> <p>The Parish Council has endorsed the need to reduce the number of dwellings to 15.</p> <p>The development would remove 1.97ha of Grade A agricultural land on a greenfield site.</p>	<p>Replace the 35 dwellings by 15 bungalows which include some social housing for village residents.</p> <p>The justification for removing the Grade A land needs to be given</p>	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1873	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3883	Dr Ian Tait [19969]		Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	The village cannot accommodate 35 dwellings which would increase the size of the village by more than 15% which is too large. The density of housing would be twice that of recent developments, which are all bungalows and include social housing, and would be out of character with the rest of the village. The Parish Council has endorsed the need to reduce the number of dwellings to 15. The development would remove 1.97ha of Grade A agricultural land on a greenfield site.	Replace the dwelling number to 15 and state that some of these dwellings are for social housing for Bawburgh residents only. The remove of the Grade A land needs to be justified and included in the proposals.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	Yes	1873	
3893	Mrs Kathryn Cross (SNC ward member for Bawburgh) [20423]		Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	There are extremely limited public transport options in Bawburgh and very few facilities to warrant such a large increase in village population therefore 35 homes contradicts the GNLP statement on.seeking to limit new development in those areas that are either poorly connected or constrained by the local highway network.	Reduce the site size to 1.4ha for 15 dwellings	Appearance at Examination	South Norfolk councillor representing Bawburgh	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1873	

3898	Collins & Coward Limited (Mr Tony Collins, Managing Director) [19997]		Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	<p>Refer to previous representations, particularly from January 2024.</p> <p>NPPF December 2023 has removed need for housing targets, therefore 1,200 homes is no longer required. This is now 'Advisory starting point' based on circumstances, therefore no basis for total number or buffer and could lead to oversupply.</p> <p>Sites capacity should be based on planning factors rather than arbitrary density. no full assessments have been undertaken.</p> <p>Bawburgh Parish Council concluded that the site should not accommodate more than 15 units – resolution of the Council on 8 August 2024.</p> <p>The Council has not conducted any further site assessment to support an increase in site size of 41%. The original site assessment was flawed and remains so. No sustainability assessment has been undertaken on the enlarged site. No agricultural land quality assessment has been undertaken to justify the loss of 1.9 hectares of Grade 3A agricultural land. The NPPF at footnote 62 confirms that lesser quality land should be used in preference to Best and Most Versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>It is clear the proposed site does not meet any of the policies and objectives of the NPPF, which is acknowledged by the Council. Therefore, in the absence of a draft allocation, a residential development of this site would never be permitted.</p>	The site should be removed or reduced to no more than 15 units as a proposed allocation on the basis it is not sound.	Appearance at Examination	Previously stated wishes to attend	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1873	<p>Tony Collins Representations - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/srq</p>
------	---	--	---	---	---	---	---------------------------	------------------------------------	--------	-----	----	-----	------	---

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3904	Mrs Kathryn Cross (SNC ward member for Bawburgh) [20423]		Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	The village cannot support 35 homes on this site due to lack of infrastructure, facilities, public transport links, safe walking or cycling routes, impact on ancient monument bridge and flood plain. The school is already at capacity and new residents will not get places there for their children for several years. There are other locations more suited to this size of development.	Amend to 'area of 1.4ha of land is allocated for 15 dwellings'	Appearance at Examination	South NORfolk councillor representing Bawburgh	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1873	

4016	Bawburgh Parish Council [19210]	Collins & Coward Limited (Mr Tony Collins, Managing Director) [19997]	Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	<p>Refer to previous representations submitted by Parish Council.</p> <p>NPPF December 2023 has removed need for housing targets, therefore 1,200 homes is no longer required. This is now 'Advisory starting point' based on circumstances, therefore no basis for total number or buffer and could lead to oversupply.</p> <p>Sites capacity should be based on planning factors rather than arbitrary density. No full assessment has been undertaken.</p> <p>Bawburgh Parish Council concluded that the site should not accommodate more than 15 units – resolution of the Council on 8 August 2024.</p> <p>The Council has not conducted any further site assessment to support an increase in site size of 41%. The original site assessment was flawed and remains so. No sustainability assessment has been undertaken on the enlarged site. No agricultural land quality assessment has been undertaken to justify the loss of 1.9 hectares of Grade 3A agricultural land. The NPPF at footnote 62 confirms that lesser quality land should be used in preference to Best and Most Versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>It is clear the proposed site does not meet any of the policies and objectives of the NPPF, which is acknowledged by the Council. Therefore, in the absence of a draft allocation, a residential development of this site would never be permitted.</p>	The site should be removed or reduced to no more than 15 units as a proposed allocation on the basis it is not sound.	Appearance at Examination	Previously stated they wish to attend	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1873	Bawburgh Parish Council - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/str
------	---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------	-----	----	-----	------	---

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4135	Environment Agency (Alasdair Hain-Cole, Planning Officer) [20421]		Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	Given the potential capacity issues around Whitlingham WRC, we request the requirement for early engagement between Anglian Water and the developer is retained in the policy text.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1841	
4162	Mr Martin Payne [20129]		Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	<p>I wholly agree with the points made by Tony Collins in his letter of 1 October stating the objections of Bawburgh Parish Council.</p> <p>In addition to these points:</p> <p>1. If the proposal is unchanged, and 35 houses are built, many more cars (70 or more?) will regularly enter Stocks Hill, a narrow and frequently very busy road where the 20mph speed limit is widely ignored. I understand that Highways have not objected, but as a resident very aware of 'rat run' traffic speeding, I would argue that it would present a real hazard. Cars belonging to 15 houses would present far less of a problem.</p> <p>2. The type of houses proposed are inappropriate for a small village. In particular, the neo-Georgian and four/five bedroom houses would be obtrusive and out of keeping. Fifteen single-storey properties in a sympathetic style, similar to those in The Warren, should be the aim.</p>	The plan should be modified so as to comprise fifteen single storey houses in a style sympathetic to this small Norfolk village.	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1873	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4172	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	Policy VC BAW1REV: Land east of Stocks Hill	<p>Anglian Water notes the statement regarding potential phasing of this site beyond the early years of the Plan given that it is located within the catchment of Whitlingham WRC. Anglian Water has a proposed growth scheme to increase dry weather flow capacity at Whitlingham WRC within our PR24 Business Plan for delivery in AMP8 (2025-2030). However, this investment is subject to final determination our Business Plan by our regulator, Ofwat, which is due in December 2024. Whitlingham WRC has been identified as a nutrient significant plant and will require phosphate and nitrogen removal upgrades to technically achievable levels (TAL) by 1st April 2030. An accelerated infrastructure delivery scheme will deliver the phosphate element of the upgrade to TAL by 31st March 2027. This will reduce the amount of nutrient mitigation required for developments occupied after these dates.</p> <p>It is noted that the policy requirement for early engagement with Anglian Water has been removed from the policy and is only referred to in the text. However, we support the requirement for a drainage strategy in the policy – it should be clarified that this assessment should include details of both surface water and foul drainage and with details to be agreed with Anglian Water in addition to the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p> <p>There are no sewers within the proposed site allocation.</p>	The drainage strategy criteria should be clarified that this assessment should include details of both surface water and foul drainage and with details to be agreed with Anglian Water in addition to the Lead Local Flood Authority.	Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1842	Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3v

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3856	Mr Keith Weston [20455]		VC DIT1 REV	VC DIT1 REV	Ditchingham Parish Council objected to the original proposal unless the access is changed from Hamilton Way. The Council repeats its objection with the extra proposed dwellings.	No more dwellings should access the site via Hamilton Way/Rider Haggard Way. Instead access should be via Waveney Road or Thwaite Road. Keith Weston (Chair Ditchingham Parish Council)	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1843	
4008	Ditchingham Farms Partnership [20485]	Evolution Town Planning (Mr Samuel Stonehouse, Associate Planner) [20484]	VC DIT1 REV	VC DIT1 REV	Please see the submitted representation statement. The extension to site VC DIT1 REV is not a sound amendment to the SNVC Housing Allocations Plan. Other sites such as the land adjoining Wildflower Way represent a more sustainable allocation. Without consulting on wider sites to cover the projected housing land shortfall, we consider the plan unsound, and legally non-compliant and that it has not been prepared in compliance with the duty to cooperate.	Please see the submitted representation statement. Alternative allocations such as the land adjoining Wildflower Way should be considered as to fill the projected housing delivery shortfall.	Appearance at Examination	To provide any necessary details regarding the proposed replacement allocation and its advantages over the extended VC DIT1 REV allocation.	Object	No	No	No	1715	E1057.C1.Rep03a - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssy
3958	Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Sarah Eglington, Planning and Advocacy Advisor) [20410]		VC DIT1 REV, 3.19	VC DIT1 REV, 13.19	We strongly support the inclusion of this paragraph stating that any potential impacts on the CWS and SSSI will need to be mitigated.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1716	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3940	NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (Mr Thomas Clare, ICS Estates Planning Liaison and Policy Lead) [20478]		Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	<p>There are 4 villages whereby the most local GP practice that covers those villages within its catchment area is located across the local authority border in East Suffolk. Two GP practices will be affected by any population increases. These practices are either currently working through a planning application for an extension funded by CIL or are in early discussions about a potential premises scheme via a potential application for CIL funding.</p> <p>The ambulance service, EEAST, are in a unique position that intersects health, transport and community safety and does not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development combined with other developments in the vicinity. This development is likely to increase demand upon existing constrained ambulance services and nationally set blue light response times. The capital required through developer contribution would form a proportion of the required funding for the provision of capacity to absorb the patient growth and demand generated by this development. Any funding would be used towards the capital cost of providing new additional ambulances and/or new additional medical equipment, which for an ambulance service is their physical infrastructure, and/or new additional parking space(s) for ambulances at existing ambulance stations.</p>	None specified. ICS would encourage continued working with LPA.	Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1846	NHS ICS Response - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3g

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3984	Norfolk County Council - Highways (Mr Richard Doleman, Principal Infrastructure Growth Planer) [20481]		Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	The Highway Authority previously expressed support for access to the site via Hamilton Way to the south. The access from Hamilton Way through the consented development (2019/1925) does not extend to the allocation boundary, potential resulting in an undeliverable allocation.	The boundary of VCDIT1 requires modification to ensure it can be accessed from the estate road of application 2019/1925.	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1876	NCC Highways - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssg
3987	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19732]		Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	<p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA for the site. The HIA recommends that archaeological investigation should be required prior to development commencing due to the cropmarks on site.</p> <p>We therefore welcome the reference to archaeological investigation prior to commencement of development on site in paragraph 3.20.</p> <p>The current reference to archaeology at criterion 6 is insufficient. We suggest that the wording is slightly amended to read:</p> <p>Norfolk's Historic Environment Service is consulted prior to application to determine the need for any archaeological assessments.</p>	<p>Amend criterion in relation to archaeology to read:</p> <p>Norfolk's Historic Environment Service is consulted prior to application to determine the need for any archaeological assessments.</p>	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1721	<p>Historic England Representation Letter - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssx</p> <p>Historic England Representation Table - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssj</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
<u>4009</u>	Ditchingham Farms Partnership [20485]	Evolution Town Planning (Mr Samuel Stonehouse, Associate Planner) [20484]	Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	Please see the submitted representation statement. The extension to site VC DIT1 REV is not a sound amendment to the SNVC Housing Allocations Plan. Other sites such as the land adjoining Wildflower Way represent a more sustainable allocation. Without consulting on wider sites to cover the projected housing land shortfall, we consider the plan unsound, and legally non-compliant and that it has not been prepared in compliance with the duty to cooperate.	Please see the submitted representation statement. The extension to site VC DIT1 REV is not a sound amendment to the SNVC Housing Allocations Plan. Other sites such as the land adjoining Wildflower Way represent a more sustainable allocation. Without consulting on wider sites to cover the projected housing land shortfall, we consider the plan unsound, and legally non-compliant and that it has not been prepared in compliance with the duty to cooperate.	Appearance at Examination	To provide commentary on the proposed alternative allocation site and provide any details which the inspector may require.	Object	No	No	No	1720	E1057.C1.Rep0 3a.pdf - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssn

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4020	Norfolk County Council - Minerals and Waste Team (Ms Caroline Jeffery, Principal Planner) [20338]		Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	<p>Norfolk County Council in its capacity as the Mineral Planning Authority considers that Policy VC DIT1 REV is currently unsound; as it is inconsistent with national policy (NPPF paragraph 218), and the adopted Development Plan in Norfolk (policy CS16 of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy), in relation to mineral resource safeguarding. Proposed allocation VC DIT1 REV is over 2ha in size and underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource, sand and gravel. Therefore, the allocation of the site for development without policy requirements to avoid needless sterilisation of the mineral is not consistent with national policy.</p> <p>The Mineral Planning Authority recognises that reference to underlain mineral resource has been included in the supporting text, however, we request inclusion of a requirement to avoid needless sterilisation of the mineral resource in the policy itself. We consider that it is appropriate and relevant for the requirements of a strategic policy (in this case Policy CS16 of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy) to be included in a site allocation policy where it sets out how the policy will apply to a specific site at the development management stage.</p>	<p>In order to include measures to avoid needless sterilisation of the safeguarded mineral resources, in accordance with paragraph 218 of the NPPF, the policy wording for this site should be amended to include the following as a policy requirement:</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>	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1722	NCC Minerals and Waste - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/sts
4106	Water Management Alliance (Ms Phillipa Nanson, Sustainable Development Officer) [20327]		Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	Major development - If surface water discharges within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD, we request that this discharge is facilitated in line with the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1719	Water Management Alliance - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stx

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4136	Environment Agency (Alasdair Hain-Cole, Planning Officer) [20421]		Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	For consistency and clarity, we recommend the wording of VC DIT1REV regarding "Early engagement with Anglian Water" is changed to reflect the wording for VC BRM1.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1718	
4173	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	Policy VC DIT1REV: Land at Thwaite's and Tunneys Lane	<p>Anglian Water supports the policy requirement for early engagement for development at this site. There is limited dry weather flow permit headroom at the WRC to accommodate future growth in the catchment. As a result, the increase in the number of dwellings on the site, together with VC BRM1 and any additional windfall development coming forward, may cumulatively result in insufficient headroom being available at the WRC. Ditchingham WRC does not have an identified growth scheme for AMP8 (2025-2030) in our PR24 Business Plan. Therefore, should a growth scheme be required it would not be delivered until beyond 2030, and development would need to be phased accordingly.</p> <p>The additional area identified to increase capacity of the site, impacts on another sewer (surface water) crossing the site, in addition to the foul sewer and water main. The policy requirement is therefore essential to ensure the protection of our assets and that they are appropriately accommodated within the development layout design.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1717	Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3v

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3975	Ditchingham Farms Partnership [16995]	Evolution Town Planning (Mr David Barker) [20472]	VC BRM1, 3.24	VC BRM1, 13.24	It is stated that the development would be required to deliver additional traffic calming features. These are unnecessary as traffic calming is already in place in the road next to the allocation. There are two traffic islands which force traffic onto a single carriageway road as shown in the photograph (see attachment). More traffic calming in the locality would be unnecessary and ineffective.	Remove allocation and allocate SN0346, or allocate SN0346 as well as current allocation to ensure that the plan is effective.	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1723	Ditchingham Farms Partnership Representations - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssd

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3974	Ditchingham Farms Partnership [16995]	Evolution Town Planning (Mr David Barker) [20472]	VC BRM1, 3.25	VC BRM1, 13.25	<p>The supporting text to the draft policy references an LVA submitted with the proposed allocation, without suggesting how the landscape impact of the proposal could actually be mitigated.</p> <p>It is not clear what is meant by a 'gateway' means or if this is appropriate in this landscape context for a settlement of this size. The development is unlikely to be more than one house deep fronting the road and we maintain that this creates difficulty in creating a built gateway feature as the scope for development is limited.</p> <p>We do not consider that a landscape buffer is appropriate, because the introduction of new landscaping itself would represent a significant change in this open landscape. Practically, the scope for landscaping is also very limited. Landscaping is likely to be the responsibility of, or in the control of, individual householders making it more difficult to maintain landscaping in the long term. On smaller sites small areas of landscaping will have less impact and be more prone to removal. The most recent addition to Broome (adjacent to allocation) to see that the landscape visual impacts are likely to be significant, with limited opportunities for landscaping to provide any meaningful 'integration'.</p> <p>Consider that the landscaping clause (necessary to make this allocation acceptable) will be ineffective and in the long term any solution will be likely to fail.</p>	Remove allocation and allocate SN0346, or allocate SN0346 as well as current allocation to ensure that the plan is effective.	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1724	Ditchingham Farms Partnership Representations - https://southnorfolkandbroadslandscapesoc2.uk/a/ssd

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3900	Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]		VC BRM1, 3.27	VC BRM1, 13.27	<p>Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road</p> <p>The text says, ‘The developer is therefore encouraged to enter into early engagement with AW regarding this matter’. This should be stronger – to say ‘must’.</p>	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1731	
3903	Evolution Town Planning (Mr David Barker) [20472]		Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	<p>Please see attached Report E1057.C1.Rep02 - This submission Objects to the Allocation of Site VCBROM1, located on the north eastern periphery of Broome, on the basis that it is not justified (in view of a more sustainable alternative) and, on the basis that there is a more sustainable alternative, the allocation is not consistent with national planning policy which sets a presumption in favour of sustainable development. We also have concerns that certain elements of the policy will not be effective. As such, we consider that the policy and the allocation will not meet the ‘test of soundness’.</p>	<p>Please see attached Report E1057.C1.Rep02 - We continue to consider that the site with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) reference SN0346 in the Ditchingham and Broome Cluster would be a more sustainable allocation and we object to this site having been discounted without sufficient justification in favour of a less sustainable alternative. We do not consider that this is a decision which should be found to be ‘sound’. Site SN0346 was put forward initially in 2021. Clearly, site SN0346 is more central in the village of Broome and is well related to the built-up area. Moreover, the development of site SN0346 would be less harmful to the character of the open countryside. Site SN0346 is more sustainable than the draft allocation site, since it is closer to facilities such as shops, bus services, and the Primary School.</p>	Appearance at Examination	To ensure the inspector understands our argument for the alternative site.	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1739	E1057.C1.Rep02a Sept 24 - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stw

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3941	NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (Mr Thomas Clare, ICS Estates Planning Liaison and Policy Lead) [20478]		Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	<p>There are 4 villages whereby the most local GP practice that covers those villages within its catchment area is located across the local authority border in East Suffolk. Two GP practices will be affected by any population increases. These practices are either currently working through a planning application for an extension funded by CIL or are in early discussions about a potential premises scheme via a potential application for CIL funding.</p> <p>The ambulance service, EEAST, are in a unique position that intersects health, transport and community safety and does not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development combined with other developments in the vicinity. This development is likely to increase demand upon existing constrained ambulance services and nationally set blue light response times. The capital required through developer contribution would form a proportion of the required funding for the provision of capacity to absorb the patient growth and demand generated by this development. Any funding would be used towards the capital cost of providing new additional ambulances and/or new additional medical equipment, which for an ambulance service is their physical infrastructure, and/or new additional parking space(s) for ambulances at existing ambulance stations.</p>	None specified. ICS would encourage continued working with LPA.	Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1847	NHS ICS Response - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.ox2.uk/a/s3g

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3959	Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Sarah Eglington, Planning and Advocacy Advisor) [20410]		Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	This allocation is in close proximity to Broome Heath County Wildlife Site (CWS)/Broome Heath Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI and as such could have an impact on these site. Impacts on these sites will need to be adequately mitigated. We recommend that text similar to that inserted at paragraph 3.19 are included in this policy.	This allocation is in close proximity to Broome Heath County Wildlife Site (CWS)/Broome Heath Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI and as such could have an impact on these site. Impacts on these sites will need to be adequately mitigated. We recommend that text similar to that inserted at paragraph 3.19 are included in this policy.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1730	

3976	Ditchingham Farms Partnership [16995]	Evolution Town Planning (Mr David Barker) [20472]	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	<p>The allocation is an extension to the eastern most houses, and extends well beyond any continuous line of homes into the countryside. The development could be characterised as ‘ribbon development’ which has traditionally been avoided by the planning system so that the character of the countryside is protected.</p> <p>The character of the countryside to the east of Broome is of an undeveloped rural area with scattered buildings. Extending a line of homes into this area would harm that rural character.</p> <p>The proposed policy acknowledges the difficulty of developing in this area and requires the development to be ‘integrated’ into the countryside. However the site already has limited boundary features, any proposed development will have a significant visual impact, such that ‘integration into the wider countryside’ is not possible. It is clear that development in this location will have a significant visual impact and that the policy is written to be ineffective since it will require a landscape outcome which cannot be achieved in this location.</p> <p>Public views are available toward the proposed allocation site from PROW Broome FP5, and since the landscape is flat, with no existing vegetation, it is unclear how the LPA propose any application could effectively mitigate the impact of development on this landscape.</p> <p>Site VCBROM1 would also not meet the requirements of NPPF Paragraph 180(b). By proposing a linear form of ribbon development into open</p>	Remove allocation and allocate SN0346, or allocate SN0346 as well as current allocation to ensure that the plan is effective.	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1739	Ditchingham Farms Partnership Representations - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssd
------	---------------------------------------	---	--	--	--	---	---------------	--	--------	-----	----	-----	------	---

[illegible]

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
<u>3977</u>	Ditchingham Farms Partnership [16995]	Evolution Town Planning (Mr David Barker) [20472]	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	<p>Proposed allocation site is a long distance from facilities compared to alternative development opportunities, so is not sustainable. This is inconsistent with the NPPF paragraphs 11 and 74.</p> <p>Broome has a pub but no other facilities. Ditchingham to the west, has a convenience store, primary school, and bus services. A good range of facilities are available to the south in Bungay. The proposed allocation is as far as it could be from the facilities in Ditchingham and Bungay. This will not encourage sustainable forms of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport and will not ensure that the village extension complies with Paragraph 74 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Paragraph 104 of the NPPF states 'transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued'. If taking opportunities for walking, cycling, and public transport was considered, then sites to the west of Broome, which are closer to facilities, would be favoured over the proposed allocation site.</p>	Remove allocation and allocate SN0346, or allocate SN0346 as well as current allocation to ensure that the plan is effective.	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1739	Ditchingham Farms Partnership Representations - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssd

3978	Ditchingham Farms Partnership [16995]	Evolution Town Planning (Mr David Barker) [20472]	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	<p>Site SN0346 is approximately 1.8 hectares in size, meaning that it offers greater opportunities for landscaping, biodiversity net gain and (if required) a larger number of houses. The site comprises five areas of land, being three areas of arable land at the eastern and western ends, and centrally in the site. Between these are two areas of recently planted woodland which would be retained to provide advanced landscaping within the development.</p> <p>To the south of the site are homes which stretch along the Old Yarmouth Road. There is a footway along the south side of Old Yarmouth Road which runs the length of the site and extends east and west to the rest of the village. To the east of the site is a small open yard with houses further east. To the west of the site is the access to Broome Pits which are fishing lakes. To the east of this is a small area of trees with new houses beyond. To the north of the site is Broome Pits fishing lakes.</p> <p>The site is well related to the built-up area of the village. There is continuous housing to the south, east, and west. New homes in this area will be seen in the context of a large number of existing homes and the development would therefore not harm the character of the built-up area.</p> <p>The site is flat and free from constraints and has a straight road frontage along the Old Yarmouth Road. There is good visibility along the road in either direction, so appropriate vehicular and pedestrian accesses could be provided along the road frontage.</p>	Remove allocation and allocate SN0346, or allocate SN0346 as well as current allocation to ensure that the plan is effective.	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1739	Ditchingham Farms Partnership Representations - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssd
----------------------	---------------------------------------	---	--	--	--	---	---------------	--	--------	-----	----	-----	------	---

[illegible]

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3988	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19732]		Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	<p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA. The HIA recommends that archaeological investigation should be required prior to development commencing. The recommendations of the HIA in relation to archaeology should be included in the policy requirements.</p> <p>The current reference to archaeology at criterion 6 is insufficient. We suggest that the wording is slightly amended to read:</p> <p>Norfolk's Historic Environment Service is consulted prior to application to determine the need for any archaeological assessments.</p>	<p>Amend criterion in relation to archaeology to read:</p> <p>Norfolk's Historic Environment Service is consulted prior to application to determine the need for any archaeological assessments.</p>	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1728	<p>Historic England Representation Letter - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssx</p> <p>Historic England Representation Table - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssj</p>
4109	Water Management Alliance (Ms Phillipa Nanson, Sustainable Development Officer) [20327]		Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Major development - Byelaw 3 applies to any proposed discharge of surface water from the proposed site. All other Board Byelaws will also apply to this development.		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1727	<p>Water Management Alliance - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stx</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4124	Rainier Developments and Strategic Land [20498]	Ceres Property (Mr Sam Hollingworth, Associate Partner) [20500]	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	<p>At paragraph 3.18 there is reference to a potential constraint to development of this proposed allocation, as Anglian Water infrastructure crosses the site. It states that “the developer is encouraged to enter into earlier engagement with AW”. We note the objection from the Broads Authority (representation ID 3900) stating that wording should be strengthened such that a developer ‘must’ enter into early engagement with Anglian Water over this matter. Regardless, whether text states ‘should’ or ‘must’ it is unclear at this juncture from the Regulation 19 Addendum whether the proposed allocation is deliverable.</p> <p>Separately, we note an objection from Norfolk Wildlife Trust (representation ID 3959) in relation to the proposed allocation’s proximity to Broome Heath County Wildlife Site (CWS) and Broome Heath Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and the potential impact of development on these.</p> <p>Whilst Norfolk Wildlife Trust recommend additional policy text is added to require mitigation of any impact, it is again not clear if development of the site as the current draft policy envisages and incorporating the requisite mitigation is deliverable.</p>	Reasonable alternatives such as GNLP3033 clearly should have been considered. It is evidently a sustainable site for development. There is no evidence to suggest it is unsuitable.	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1741	<p>Rainier Developments - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stn</p> <p>Rainier Developments Vision - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3t</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4160	W R Church [20502]	Durrants (Jasmine Philpott) [20151]	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	On behalf of the landowner, Durrants can confirm that the land required to deliver VCBRM1 remains available. The site represents a sustainable location for development in Broome, following the recent completion of the properties adjacent. Importantly, it is positioned away from Broome Heath, a SSSI and County Wildlife Site, as well as benefiting from an existing footpath connection and traffic calming measures which are already in place. The allocation can be readily delivered, and the landowner remains committed to bringing the site forward for development.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1726	
4164	Broome Parish Council (Broome Parish Clerk) [12613]		Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	<p>The response of Broome Parish Council to the Yarmouth Road for 12+ houses plan is to REJECT the proposal for the following reasons as it has previously.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Erodes remaining countryside between Broome and Ellingham. 2. Means loss of arable farm land. 3. Is building in open landscape. 4. Sets no maximum number of houses. 5. There is other land available within the developed area of Broome. 	Removal of the 12+ allocation of housing for Yarmouth Road, Broome	Not Specified		Object	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1864	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4167	Rainier Developments and Strategic Land [20498]	Ceres Property (Mr Sam Hollingworth, Associate Partner) [20500]	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	<p>At paragraph 3.18 there is reference to a potential constraint to development of this proposed allocation, as Anglian Water infrastructure crosses the site. It states that “the developer is encouraged to enter into earlier engagement with AW”. We note the objection from the Broads Authority (representation ID 3900) stating that wording should be strengthened such that a developer ‘must’ enter into early engagement with Anglian Water over this matter. Regardless, whether text states ‘should’ or ‘must’ it is unclear at this juncture from the Regulation 19 Addendum whether the proposed allocation is deliverable.</p> <p>Separately, we note an objection from Norfolk Wildlife Trust (representation ID 3959) in relation to the proposed allocation’s proximity to Broome Heath County Wildlife Site (CWS) and Broome Heath Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and the potential impact of development on these.</p> <p>Whilst Norfolk Wildlife Trust recommend additional policy text is added to require mitigation of any impact, it is again not clear if development of the site as the current draft policy envisages and incorporating the requisite mitigation is deliverable.</p>	Reasonable alternatives such as GNLP0321 and GNLP1032 clearly should have been considered. It is evidently a sustainable site for development. There is no evidence to suggest it is unsuitable.	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1741	<p>Rainier and Octagon - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s34 Rainier and Octagon Appendix A - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s35 Rainier and Octagon Appendix B - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s36</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4174	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Anglian Water supports the policy requirement for early engagement for development at this site. There is limited dry weather flow permit headroom at the WRC to accommodate future growth in the catchment. As a result, this additional site, together with VC DIT1REV and any additional windfall development coming forward, may cumulatively result in insufficient headroom being available at the WRC. Ditchingham WRC does not have an identified growth scheme for AMP8 (2025-2030) in our PR24 Business Plan. Therefore, should a growth scheme be required it would not be delivered until beyond 2030, and development would need to be phased accordingly.		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1725	Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3v
4194	Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]		Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	Policy VC BRM1: Land west of Old Yarmouth Road	<p>Light pollution</p> <p>Most of the proposed sites are on the edge of settlements. Particular care and attention need to be given to any proposals for external lighting as well as any design that has a lot of glazing. Lighting in such edge of settlement areas needs to be fully justified, serve a specific purpose, be of the right design and intensity so as to not affect dark skies, such as the intrinsic dark skies of the Broads. Reference to lighting being only needed if fully justified and well designed needs to be made in relevant policies, especially the following as they are close to, albeit separated from, the Broads. Also, design with lots of glazing need to be avoided unless there is going to be automated shades incorporated into the design.</p>	We recommend that for sites on the edge of settlement you include wording such as: 'Given that this site is on the edge of the settlement, particular care and attention will be given to lighting of such schemes. This includes external lighting, as well as mitigation for designs with lots of glazing. Schemes will need to fully justify the need for lighting, provide detail of the design and ensure that lighting is on only when it is needed, and designed to not add to light pollution. Designs with a lot of glazing are required to provide mitigation in the form of automated shades that are shut between dusk and dawn.'	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1732	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3942	NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (Mr Thomas Clare, ICS Estates Planning Liaison and Policy Lead) [20478]		Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	<p>There are 4 villages whereby the most local GP practice that covers those villages within its catchment area is located across the local authority border in East Suffolk. Two GP practices will be affected by any population increases. These practices are either currently working through a planning application for an extension funded by CIL or are in early discussions about a potential premises scheme via a potential application for CIL funding.</p> <p>The ambulance service, EEAST, are in a unique position that intersects health, transport and community safety and does not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development combined with other developments in the vicinity. This development is likely to increase demand upon existing constrained ambulance services and nationally set blue light response times. The capital required through developer contribution would form a proportion of the required funding for the provision of capacity to absorb the patient growth and demand generated by this development. Any funding would be used towards the capital cost of providing new additional ambulances and/or new additional medical equipment, which for an ambulance service is their physical infrastructure, and/or new additional parking space(s) for ambulances at existing ambulance stations.</p>	None specified. ICS would encourage continued working with LPA.	Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1848	NHS ICS Response - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3g
3960	Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Sarah Eglington, Planning and Advocacy Advisor) [20410]		Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	We are pleased to note that this policy includes a specification for the retention, protection and enhancement of the existing vegetation and trees		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1733	

3983	Norfolk County Council - Minerals and Waste Team (Ms Caroline Jeffery, Principal Planner) [20338]		Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	<p>Norfolk County Council in its capacity as the Mineral Planning Authority considers that Policy VC EAR2 is currently unsound; as it is inconsistent with national policy (NPPF paragraph 218), and the adopted Development Plan in Norfolk (policy CS16 of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy), in relation to mineral resource safeguarding.</p> <p>The proposed site allocation VC EAR2, is located within the consultation area for safeguarded mineral extraction site, Earsham Quarry, which is only 25m from the boundary of site VC EAR2 at the closest point, with the A143 in between. The quarry has permission for mineral extraction and processing until 2040. There is currently no reference to this in either the site assessment or the site policy.</p> <p>Proposed allocation site VC EAR2 also underlain by a safeguarded mineral resource, sand and gravel. However, as the site is less than 2 hectares in size, we do not consider that a policy requirement regarding investigation and prior extraction of mineral on the allocation site is necessary.</p> <p>However, the allocation of the site for development without policy requirements to protect the existing mineral extraction operation is not consistent with national policy. The agent of change principle (paragraph 193 of the NPPF) would also apply.</p> <p>We consider that it is appropriate and relevant for the requirements of a strategic policy (in this case Policy CS16 of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy) to be included in a site allocation</p>	<p>In order to include measures to avoid needless sterilisation of the safeguarded mineral resources, in accordance with paragraph 218 of the NPPF and consistency with the agent of change principle (paragraph 193 of the NPPF), the policy wording for this site should be amended to include the following as a policy requirement:</p> <p>‘The site is within the consultation area for a safeguarded mineral extraction site and the development must not prevent or prejudice the use of the existing mineral extraction site unless suitable alternative provision is made, or the applicant demonstrates that the site no longer meets the needs of the aggregate industry.’</p>	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1737	NCC Minerals and Waste - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssf
------	---	--	--	--	---	---	---------------	--	--------	-----	----	-----	------	--

[illegible]

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3989	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19732]		Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	<p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA. The HIA recommends that archaeological investigation should be required prior to development commencing. The recommendations of the HIA in relation to archaeology should be included in the policy requirements.</p> <p>The current reference to archaeology at criterion 6 is insufficient. We suggest that the wording is slightly amended to read:</p> <p>Norfolk's Historic Environment Service is consulted prior to application to determine the need for any archaeological assessments.</p>	<p>Amend criterion in relation to archaeology to read:</p> <p>Norfolk's Historic Environment Service is consulted prior to application to determine the need for any archaeological assessments.</p>	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1738	<p>Historic England Representation Letter - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssx</p> <p>Historic England Representation Table - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssj</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4021	Badger Building (Mr Justin Coote) [20487]		Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	<p>Additional information is also attached by way of demonstrating that the frontage footpath and connection of the footpath to the existing can be delivered within the highway boundary and land owned by the County. I have attached the highway boundary maps and an overlay of the footpath onto the highways boundary to show the works are deliverable. There is also a triangular wooded area adjacent to the site that may require some trees/hedgerow cut back to facilitate the footpath. The title for this area is attached showing its owned by the County Council.</p> <p>Intend to submit a planning application for the site once the allocation is confirmed following undertaking all necessary supporting reports, surveys and design.</p> <p>Once permission is granted we would look to be starting on site within 18 months. The delivery of the site should be two years from start.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1742	Location Plan - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/stt Concept Plan - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/st3 Highway Works - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/st4 Footpath Photo Study - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/st5 Highway Sketch - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/st6 Highway Boundary Plan - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/st7 Official Copy - Register - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/st8 Official Copy - Title Plan - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/st9
4111	Water Management Alliance (Ms Phillipa Nanson, Sustainable Development Officer) [20327]		Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	Major development - If surface water discharges within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD, we request that this discharge is facilitated in line with the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1734	Water Management Alliance - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/stx

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4125	Rainier Developments and Strategic Land [20498]	Ceres Property (Mr Sam Hollingworth, Associate Partner) [20500]	Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	<p>We note the objection from Norfolk County Council in its capacity as the Mineral Planning Authority (representation ID 3989). The County Council notes this proposed allocation is located within the consultation area for the safeguarded mineral extraction site (Earsham Quarry), that this quarry is on 25m from the boundary of the proposed allocation, and that it has permission for mineral extraction and processing until 2040.</p> <p>The County Council requests additional policy text that includes a requirement that the development of the site “must not prevent or prejudice the use of the existing mineral extraction site unless suitable alternative provision is made, or the applicant demonstrates that the site no longer meets the needs of the aggregate industry”.</p> <p>However, it is not clear from the Regulation 19 Addendum if development of the site as the current draft policy envisages and incorporating the requisite mitigation is deliverable.</p> <p>Additionally, it is not clear what the impact of the existing quarry on the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed allocation would be, or whether this would be acceptable.</p>	Reasonable alternatives such as GNLP3033 clearly should have been considered. It is evidently a sustainable site for development. There is no evidence to suggest it is unsuitable.	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1743	<p>Rainier Developments - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stn</p> <p>Rainier Developments Vision - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3t</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4137	Environment Agency (Alasdair Hain-Cole, Planning Officer) [20421]		Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	<p>Current data shows limited capacity at Earsham WRC. While there may be some room for limited growth, the proposed allocations and resulting increase in foul water flows pose the potential risk of harm to the waterbody receiving treated effluent from Earsham WRC.</p> <p>We therefore recommend including within policies VC EAR1 and VC EAR2 the requirement for developers of the site to enter into early engagement with Anglian Water in order to demonstrate there is sufficient capacity in the network and receiving WRC to accommodate foul flows from the development.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1758	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4168	Rainier Developments and Strategic Land [20498]	Ceres Property (Mr Sam Hollingworth, Associate Partner) [20500]	Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	<p>We note the objection from Norfolk County Council in its capacity as the Mineral Planning Authority (representation ID 3989). The County Council notes this proposed allocation is located within the consultation area for the safeguarded mineral extraction site (Earsham Quarry), that this quarry is on 25m from the boundary of the proposed allocation, and that it has permission for mineral extraction and processing until 2040.</p> <p>The County Council requests additional policy text that includes a requirement that the development of the site “must not prevent or prejudice the use of the existing mineral extraction site unless suitable alternative provision is made, or the applicant demonstrates that the site no longer meets the needs of the aggregate industry”.</p> <p>However, it is not clear from the Regulation 19 Addendum if development of the site as the current draft policy envisages and incorporating the requisite mitigation is deliverable.</p> <p>Additionally, it is not clear what the impact of the existing quarry on the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed allocation would be, or whether this would be acceptable.</p>	Reasonable alternatives such as GNLP0321 and GNLP1032 clearly should have been considered. It is evidently a sustainable site for development. There is no evidence to suggest it is unsuitable.	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1743	<p>Rainier and Octagon - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s34 Rainier and Octagon Appendix A - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s35 Rainier and Octagon Appendix B - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s36</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4175	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	<p>The site is on the edge of the Earsham-Bungay Road WRC. There is capacity for the proposed level of growth as there is sufficient dry weather flow headroom available at the WRC. The developer would need to engage with Anglian Water regarding connections for water supply and wastewater in the usual way.</p> <p>We support the need for a site-specific flood risk assessment because of the identified groundwater flood risk. Groundwater flooding and elevated water table levels can inundate our underground infrastructure and result in sewer flooding and loss of service for some properties/communities in periods of prolonged/intensive rainfall. Unfortunately, there is a lack of legislation that governs this type of scenario (where high groundwater levels impact sewerage assets, but do not cause an ‘above ground’ flood), and so we have held multiple workshops and discussions with Norfolk Strategic Flood Alliance partner organisations, in particular the Environment Agency, about managing groundwater differently in the future. Ensuring that new development is resilient to all forms of flood risk is therefore critical, and flood risk is managed appropriately to minimise cumulative impacts including on our existing and new infrastructure networks.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1759	Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3v

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4195	Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]		Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	Policy VC EAR2: Land north of The Street	<p>Light pollution</p> <p>Most of the proposed sites are on the edge of settlements. Particular care and attention need to be given to any proposals for external lighting as well as any design that has a lot of glazing. Lighting in such edge of settlement areas needs to be fully justified, serve a specific purpose, be of the right design and intensity so as to not affect dark skies, such as the intrinsic dark skies of the Broads. Reference to lighting being only needed if fully justified and well designed needs to be made in relevant policies, especially the following as they are close to, albeit separated from, the Broads. Also, design with lots of glazing need to be avoided unless there is going to be automated shades incorporated into the design.</p>	We recommend that for sites on the edge of settlement you include wording such as: ‘Given that this site is on the edge of the settlement, particular care and attention will be given to lighting of such schemes. This includes external lighting, as well as mitigation for designs with lots of glazing. Schemes will need to fully justify the need for lighting, provide detail of the design and ensure that lighting is on only when it is needed, and designed to not add to light pollution. Designs with a lot of glazing are required to provide mitigation in the form of automated shades that are shut between dusk and dawn.’	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1736	
3894	Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]		VC GIL1REV, 5.12	VC GIL1REV, 16.12	The policy states: ‘The boundary of the site incorporates areas at both surface and fluvial (Zones 2 and 3a) flood risk in the south-western corner and a remaining small area of tidal flooding in the southeast corner, which it is recommended are left undeveloped. Development of the site will require a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and strategy, to inform the layout of the site’. This should be made stronger and state ‘which must be left undeveloped’ as it is not acceptable to be allocating development in Zones 2 and 3a.	Policy should be made stronger and state to state the areas of flood risk ‘which must be left undeveloped’ as it is not acceptable to be allocating development in Zones 2 and 3a.	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1849	
4196	Water Management Alliance (Ms Phillipa Nanson, Sustainable Development Officer) [20327]		VC GIL1REV, 5.13	VC GIL1REV, 16.13	Major development - A riparian watercourse runs from the south-east corner of the site boundary and feeds into the Waveney, Lower Yare and Lothingland IDD. If surface water discharges within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD, we request that this discharge is facilitated in line with the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1746	Water Management Alliance - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stx

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3901	Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]		VC GIL1REV, 5.14	VC GIL1REV, 16.14	It also states; ‘The developer of the site is recommended to enter into early engagement with Anglian Water...’. Again, this should be stronger – to say ‘must’.	It also states; ‘The developer of the site is recommended to enter into early engagement with Anglian Water...’. Again, this should be stronger – to say ‘must’.	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1744	
4176	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		VC GIL1REV, 5.14	VC GIL1REV, 16.14	Anglian Water welcomes reference to the limited capacity of the Beccles-Marsh Lane WRC and the need for early engagement to determine whether there is sufficient capacity in the network and receiving WRC. Beccles-Marsh Lane WRC has been identified for investment in a growth scheme to increase dry weather flow capacity in the PR24 Business Plan for AMP8 (2025-2030). Our Business Plan is subject to final determination by our regulator, Ofwat – this is expected in December 2024.		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1745	Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s3v

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3886	Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]		Policy VC GIL1REV: South of Geldeston Road and Daisy Way	Policy VC GIL1REV: South of Geldeston Road and Daisy Way	<p>Light pollution</p> <p>Most of the proposed sites are on the edge of settlements. Particular care and attention need to be given to any proposals for external lighting as well as any design that has a lot of glazing. Lighting in such edge of settlement areas needs to be fully justified, serve a specific purpose, be of the right design and intensity so as to not affect dark skies, such as the intrinsic dark skies of the Broads. Reference to lighting being only needed if fully justified and well designed needs to be made in relevant policies, especially the following as they are close to, albeit separated from, the Broads. Also, design with lots of glazing need to be avoided unless there is going to be automated shades incorporated into the design.</p> <p>Policy VC GIL1REV: South of Geldeston Road and Daisy Way</p> <p>Our concern is incremental pressure and expansion of development around Gillingham. Again, one of the main concerns is lighting and so consideration of lighting is of particular reference to this policy.</p>	We recommend that for sites on the edge of settlement you include wording such as: ‘Given that this site is on the edge of the settlement, particular care and attention will be given to lighting of such schemes. This includes external lighting, as well as mitigation for designs with lots of glazing. Schemes will need to fully justify the need for lighting, provide detail of the design and ensure that lighting is on only when it is needed, and designed to not add to light pollution. Designs with a lot of glazing are required to provide mitigation in the form of automated shades that are shut between dusk and dawn.’	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1865	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3946	NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (Mr Thomas Clare, ICS Estates Planning Liaison and Policy Lead) [20478]		Policy VC GIL1REV: South of Geldeston Road and Daisy Way	Policy VC GIL1REV: South of Geldeston Road and Daisy Way	<p>There are 4 villages whereby the most local GP practice that covers those villages within its catchment area is located across the local authority border in East Suffolk. Two GP practices will be affected by any population increases. These practices are either currently working through a planning application for an extension funded by CIL or are in early discussions about a potential premises scheme via a potential application for CIL funding.</p> <p>The ambulance service, EEAST, are in a unique position that intersects health, transport and community safety and does not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development combined with other developments in the vicinity. This development is likely to increase demand upon existing constrained ambulance services and nationally set blue light response times. The capital required through developer contribution would form a proportion of the required funding for the provision of capacity to absorb the patient growth and demand generated by this development. Any funding would be used towards the capital cost of providing new additional ambulances and/or new additional medical equipment, which for an ambulance service is their physical infrastructure, and/or new additional parking space(s) for ambulances at existing ambulance stations.</p>	None specified. ICS would encourage continued working with LPA.	Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1850	NHS ICS Response - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3g

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4139	Environment Agency (Alasdair Hain-Cole, Planning Officer) [20421]		Policy VC GIL1REV: South of Geldeston Road and Daisy Way	Policy VC GIL1REV: South of Geldeston Road and Daisy Way	We request changes to the policy wording of VC GIL1REV to include the requirement for early engagement with Anglian Water in order to demonstrate there is sufficient capacity in the network and receiving WRC to accommodate foul flows from the development.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1851	
4199	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19732]		Policy VC GIL1REV: South of Geldeston Road and Daisy Way	Policy VC GIL1REV: South of Geldeston Road and Daisy Way	<p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA. The HIA recommends that archaeological investigation should be required prior to development commencing. The recommendations of the HIA in relation to archaeology</p> <p>should be included in the policy requirements.</p> <p>The current reference to archaeology at criterion 6 is insufficient. We suggest that the wording is slightly amended to read:</p> <p>Norfolk's Historic Environment Service is consulted prior to application to determine the need for any archaeological assessments.</p>	<p>Amend criterion 6 to read:</p> <p>Norfolk's Historic Environment Service is consulted prior to application to determine the need for any archaeological assessments.</p>	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1747	<p>Historic England Representation Letter - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssx</p> <p>Historic England Representation Table - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssj</p>
4140	Environment Agency (Alasdair Hain-Cole, Planning Officer) [20421]		Policy VC GEL1: North of Kell's Way	Policy VC GEL1: North of Kell's Way	<p>Current data shows limited capacity at Ellingham WRC. While there may be some room for limited growth, the proposed allocations and resulting increase in foul water flows pose the potential risk of harm to the waterbody receiving treated effluent from Ellingham WRC.</p> <p>We therefore recommend including within policy VC GEL1 the requirement for developers of the site to enter into early engagement with Anglian Water in order to demonstrate there is sufficient capacity in the network and receiving WRC to accommodate foul flows from the development.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1852	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
<u>4014</u>	Bennett Homes [19097]	Lanpro Services Ltd (Mr Charles Judson) [20483]	VC SWA1, 6.16	VC SWA1, 25.16	The Site is identified as 'VC SWA1' within the South Norfolk VCHAP (Regulation 19) and is located immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary on the eastern side of Swardeston. The Site comprises of 1ha of brownfield land formerly occupied by a plant nursery, with redundant greenhouses and a former farm shop remaining on the Site. Only minor amendments are proposed to paragraph 6.16, the pre-amble to Policy VC SWA1. These minor amendments are not considered to have a material bearing on the interpretation of Policy VC SWA1.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1749	Bennett Homes Representations - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssp

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3938	NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (Mr Thomas Clare, ICS Estates Planning Liaison and Policy Lead) [20478]		Policy VC SWA1: Land off Bobbins Way	Policy VC SWA1: Land off Bobbins Way	<p>Proposed sites in Barford and Swardeston will increase pressure on already constrained GP practices in Hethersett and Mulbarton, these Practices are part of the Humbleyard GP practice group. There are discussions currently ongoing between the Council and GP practices regarding mitigation for the amount of population growth these areas have already seen and that will be happening in the near future.</p> <p>The ambulance service, EEAST, are in a unique position that intersects health, transport and community safety and does not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development combined with other developments in the vicinity. This development is likely to increase demand upon existing constrained ambulance services and nationally set blue light response times. The capital required through developer contribution would form a proportion of the required funding for the provision of capacity to absorb the patient growth and demand generated by this development. Any funding would be used towards the capital cost of providing new additional ambulances and/or new additional medical equipment, which for an ambulance service is their physical infrastructure, and/or new additional parking space(s) for ambulances at existing ambulance stations.</p>	None specified. ICS encourage continued working with LPA.	Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1853	NHS ICS Response - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3g

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
<u>3991</u>	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19732]		Policy VC SWA1: Land off Bobbins Way	Policy VC SWA1: Land off Bobbins Way	<p>Amend archaeology criterion to read</p> <p>Norfolk's Historic Environment Service is consulted prior to application to determine the need for any archaeological assessments.</p>	<p>Amend criterion in relation to archaeology to read:</p> <p>Norfolk's Historic Environment Service is consulted prior to application to determine the need for any archaeological assessments.</p>	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1748	<p>Historic England Representation Letter - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssx</p> <p>Historic England Representation Table - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssj</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3939	NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (Mr Thomas Clare, ICS Estates Planning Liaison and Policy Lead) [20478]		Policy VC SWA2REV: Land on Main Road	Policy VC SWA2REV: Land on Main Road	<p>Proposed sites in Barford and Swardeston will increase pressure on already constrained GP practices in Hethersett and Mulbarton, these Practices are part of the Humbleyard GP practice group. There are discussions currently ongoing between the Council and GP practices regarding mitigation for the amount of population growth these areas have already seen and that will be happening in the near future.</p> <p>The ambulance service, EEAST, are in a unique position that intersects health, transport and community safety and does not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development combined with other developments in the vicinity. This development is likely to increase demand upon existing constrained ambulance services and nationally set blue light response times. The capital required through developer contribution would form a proportion of the required funding for the provision of capacity to absorb the patient growth and demand generated by this development. Any funding would be used towards the capital cost of providing new additional ambulances and/or new additional medical equipment, which for an ambulance service is their physical infrastructure, and/or new additional parking space(s) for ambulances at existing ambulance stations.</p>	None specified. ICS would encourage continued working with LPA.	Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1854	NHS ICS Response - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3g

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3985	Norfolk County Council - LLFA (Ms Sarah Luff, Strategic Flood Risk Planning Officer) [20414]		Policy VC SWA2REV: Land on Main Road	Policy VC SWA2REV: Land on Main Road	<p>The LLFA considers one element which forms part of this SNDC Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan Regulation 19 Pre-submission Addendum consultation document (Policy SWA2REV: Land on Main Road, Swardeston) to be unsound when assessed against the tests for soundness set out in Paragraph 35, Criteria C: Effective and Criteria D: Consistent with National Policy of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Policy SWA2REV and its supporting text, there is an absence of references made to the consideration of surface water and flood risks associated with the site and any future development of it. Furthermore, the absence of the consideration of flood risk in the Policy text for SWA2REV is considered inconsistent with the approach adopted by SNDC as part of the Village Clusters Housing Allocations document for other proposed site allocations when compared to other sites with similar flood risk issues. This means the Policy fails to support the principles set out in the NPPF (19th December 2023) in respect of the consideration of flood risk management. • The LLFA are not objecting on the grounds of the principle of the development of the site, but on the level of information required within Policy SWA2REV relating to flood risk and the consideration of flood risk management and its supporting text that will guide the site's future deliverability. 	<p>An assessment within the supporting text of any flood risks associated with the site and the surrounding area.</p> <p>A requirement within the Policy Text for the submission of a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and strategy, to inform the layout of the site, which has regard to the requirements of the Stage 2 VC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the preparation of a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan.</p>	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	No	1875	NCC Lead Local Flood Authority - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssh

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3992	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19732]		Policy VC SWA2REV: Land on Main Road	Policy VC SWA2REV: Land on Main Road	<p>Amend archaeology criterion to read</p> <p>Norfolk's Historic Environment Service is consulted prior to application to determine the need for any archaeological assessments.</p>	<p>Amend criterion in relation to archaeology to read</p> <p>Norfolk's Historic Environment Service is consulted prior to application to determine the need for any archaeological assessments.</p>	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1750	<p>Historic England Representation Letter - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssx</p> <p>Historic England Representation Table - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssj</p>

<u>4015</u>	Bennett Homes [19097]	Lanpro Services Ltd (Mr Charles Judson) [20483]	Policy VC SWA2REV: Land on Main Road	Policy VC SWA2REV: Land on Main Road	<p>The Site is identified as ‘VC SWA2REV’ within the South Norfolk VCHAP (Regulation 19) and is located to the south-east of the junction between Main Road and Gowthorpe Lane, Swardeston. The Site comprises of agricultural land and is subject to planning application 2023/0908 (made by Bennett Homes) for full planning permission for a development of 43 new dwellings and associated external works.</p> <p>The proposed amendments include significant changes to paragraph 6.21-6.27 which provide the context to Policy VC SWA2REV. The policy wording is then amended, amongst other changes, to alter the number of dwellings that the site is allocated for from ‘approximately 30 dwellings’ to ‘approximately 40 dwellings’.</p> <p>Bennett Homes fully supports the uplift in dwellings from approximately 30 to 40, and considers that the allocation of the Site supports the principle of application 2023/0908 which Bennett Homes are anticipating will be heard at Planning Committee in Autumn 2024 with an officer recommendation of approval.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this support for Policy VC SWA2REV as amended through this current consultation, Bennett Homes maintain that the submitted application for 43 dwellings would have been acceptable under previous iterations of this policy and that the effect of the proposed amendment to Policy VC SWA2REV would not result in any increase in actual housing numbers in Swardeston (as these would have been delivered regardless of the proposed amendment). This provides further justification for</p>	<p>First bullet point is amended to read:</p> <p>“The provision of a 2.0m wide footway along the site frontage with Main Road...”</p>	Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1752	Bennett Homes Representations - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssp
-------------	-----------------------	---	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	---	---------------	--	---------	---------------	---------------	---------------	------	---

[illegible]

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4177	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		Policy VC SWA2REV: Land on Main Road	Policy VC SWA2REV: Land on Main Road	<p>The site is on the edge of the Swardeston Common WRC catchment. There is capacity for the proposed level of growth as there is sufficient dry weather flow headroom available at the WRC. The developer would need to engage with Anglian Water regarding connections for water supply and wastewater in the usual way. We have no objection to the removal of the policy requirement relating to wastewater capacity due to current capacity availability.</p> <p>Swardeston Common WRC has been identified as a nutrient significant plant and will require phosphate and nitrogen removal upgrades to technically achievable levels by 1st April 2030. This will reduce the amount of nutrient mitigation required for developments occupied after this date.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1751	<p>Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3v</p>
3851	Mr Dean King [20458]		VC ROC1, 7.9	VC ROC1, 29.9	<p>In my opinion the infrastructure of the village already is unable to support the current population. Unless improvements in traffic management to stop the village street being used as a 'rat run' when the A146 is busy or is blocked because of frequent road incidents there will be accidents. The street is often double parked causing restrictions in the current traffic use. The schools in the area are currently in demand from people who travel from Norwich. Telephone, sewage and other services are currently straining to deliver to the current population.</p>	Reduce the proposed number of dwellings proposed	Appearance at Examination	Local voices from the village are essential, as these are the people that it effects	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1877	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4098	Mr John Heathcote [20011]	John Long Planning (Mr John Long, Owner) [13586]	VC ROC1, 7.13	VC ROC1, 29.13	<p>The proposed additional text confirming that the trees on the eastern boundary are now the subject of a Tree Preservation Order and will need to be taken into account when an application for the site's development is formulated; and also protected during the construction phase is acknowledged and accepted.</p> <p>The Landowners note the proposed change to paragraph 7.13, suggesting that options for the retention of the oak tree on the site frontage should be considered. However, the tree has now been removed following an assessment of the tree's condition. The Landowners Arboricultural Assessment of the frontage tree (Robert Arboriculture Ltd, 2 May 2023) confirmed that the tree's physical and structural condition made it unsuitable for long-term retention, and potentially, a significant risk to the highway and not suitable for inclusion within a TPO either. The LPA accepted this advice and the application to fell this tree (ref: 2023/1467) was approved on 5 June 2023. The tree was removed on the 25 August 2023 in accordance with the consent. It is therefore suggested that the reference to the possible retention of this tree is out of date and redundant and should be removed from the document.</p>	<p>Nb Not a matter of soundness, but a factual correction:</p> <p>VCROC1 - Para 7.13:</p> <p>The Landowners note the proposed change to paragraph 7.13, suggesting that options for the retention of the oak tree on the site frontage should be considered. However, the tree has now been removed following an assessment of the tree's condition. The Landowners Arboricultural Assessment of the frontage tree (Robert Arboriculture Ltd, 2 May 2023) confirmed that the tree's physical and structural condition made it unsuitable for long-term retention, and potentially, a significant risk to the highway and not suitable for inclusion within a TPO either. The LPA accepted this advice and the application to fell this tree (ref: 2023/1467) was approved on 5 June 2023. The tree was removed on the 25 August 2023 in accordance with the consent.</p> <p>Suggested Change:</p> <p>Removal of the reference in para. 7.13 to the "possible retention of the frontage tree".</p>	Appearance at Examination	To support the proposed allocation of VCROC1 and answer any questions posed by the Inspector or that may arise during the Plan's examination.	Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1753	John Long VCROC1 - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stg

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4099	Mr John Heathcote [20011]	John Long Planning (Mr John Long, Owner) [13586]	VC ROC1, 7.13	VC ROC1, 29.13	The proposed additional text requiring the construction materials of the proposed footpath connection between the south-west corner of the site and The Street, to the east of Old Hall Barn and Hayloft footpath to be appropriate to the designated heritage asset is acknowledged and accepted. The Landowners suggest that the construction materials will also need to be appropriate to its current and continued use as a field access.		Appearance at Examination	To support the proposed allocation of VCROC1 and answer any questions posed by the Inspector or that may arise during the Plan's examination.	Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1753	John Long VCROC1 - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stg
4100	Mr John Heathcote [20011]	John Long Planning (Mr John Long, Owner) [13586]	VC ROC1, 7.13	VC ROC1, 29.13	The Landowner highway advice confirms that a safe access into the site is possible and a Manual for Streets Compliant visibility splay can be achieved (the advice suggests that the minimum standards can be exceeded). The advice also confirms that a 2m width footway along the New Inn Site frontage can also be achieved.		Appearance at Examination	To support the proposed allocation of VCROC1 and answer any questions posed by the Inspector or that may arise during the Plan's examination.	Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1753	John Long VCROC1 - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stg

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4085	Mr Keith Godley [19029]		VC ROC1, 7.14	VC ROC1, 29.14	<p>The proposed development at VCROC1 should not proceed. The council's HIA continues to be inaccurate and unsound. Building on this site would significantly erode the significance and understanding of the Old Hall Farmhouse and Farmstead, going against guidelines outlined in</p> <p>the NPPF ie its legality is questionable. The council's use of exemption sites as precedents in the justification of the use of this</p> <p>site is a contradiction. Finally, proceeding would be ignoring the concerns of over 70 people who objected during the Regulation 18, almost more than any other proposed site, further eroding trust in local government and its processes.</p>	In order to preserve views towards the heritage assets to the west of the proposed site, we cannot see how this can be achieved with any development which extends south of Eel Catcher's Close and propose that an extension of Eel Catcher's Close to the east (and not to the South) should be the limit of the development.	Appearance at Examination	Given we have now been through Reg 18, Reg 19 and Addended Reg 19 and still feel the HIA for the proposed site and the proposed mitigations are inadequate, trust has been lost in the process and we feel we need to participate in the sessions to convey our objections and listen to the council's reasoning.	Object	No	No	No	1754	<p>Heritage Impact Assessment 23.12. VCROC1 Rockland St Mary.Final.pdf - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/stc</p> <p>Godley Objection REG19 Oct 2024.docx - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/std</p>

4097	Mr John Heathcote [20011]	John Long Planning (Mr John Long, Owner) [13586]	VC ROC1, 7.14	VC ROC1, 29.14	<p>The Landowner's heritage advice concurs with the Council Heritage Impact Assessment and confirms that a development of 25 dwellings can be accommodated on the site without an adverse impact on nearby heritage assets. The Landowners note the provisions in the latest iteration of policy (Policy VC-ROC1, Reg. 19 Addendum version) to retain an area at the western end of the site free from development, to protect the setting of the nearby heritage assets.</p> <p>The Landowners note the proposed revision to the Policy VC ROC1 and its supporting justification and have carefully considered the proposed changes and the Council's supporting information including the Heritage Impact Assessment for the site (South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan Heritage Impact Assessments Regulation 19 Pre-submission Addendum).</p> <p>The proposed additional text noting the presence of nearby heritage assets is acknowledged and accepted. The Landowners own Heritage advice concurs with the Council's heritage advice in terms of the significance of the heritage assets in question, and that their agricultural setting is an important part of understanding this. There is no direct harm to the built heritage assets, and any harm to the significance of the setting of the heritage assets caused by the proposal is considered to be low level with a less than substantial harm to the setting. This low level of harm and needs to be balanced with the scheme's benefits including delivering much needed housing in an area where there is a need for new homes; and the fact that other development in the village nearby has gradually changed the historic character of the area</p>		Appearance at Examination	To support the proposed allocation of VCROC1 and answer any questions posed by the Inspector or that may arise during the Plan's examination.	Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1755	John Long VCROC1 - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stg
----------------------	---------------------------	--	---------------	----------------	---	--	---------------------------	---	---------	-----	-----	-----	------	---

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
					<p>in any case. There is also an opportunity to mitigate some of this harm through sensitive design that respects the character of the area.</p> <p>The Landowners consider that the proposed policy wording change to ensure that an area at the western section of the site is kept free from residential development to respect the setting of the nearby heritage assets and preserved long views from the listed building and the agricultural land to the south is an appropriate response; and that the designation of this area as open space is justified. The expectation is that the extent of the open space area will be considered and determined at the planning application stage taking account of the policy requirement, the Council's Heritage Impact Assessment and the Landowners own Heritage advice. Pre-application discussions with the Council will also provide an opportunity to confirm the extent of the open space and ensure a sensitive layout.</p>									
3936	Bramerton Parish Council (Bramerton Parish Clerk) [19041]		Policy VC ROC1: Land south of New Inn Hill	Policy VC ROC1: Land south of New Inn Hill	Bramerton Parish Council agrees with the plan overall, however we have reservations as to the impact of the proposed plan locally, in particular the impact of the development on traffic problems through the village.	No changes to recommend.	Written Representation		Object	Yes	Yes	Yes	1855	

4096	Mr John Heathcote [20011]	John Long Planning (Mr John Long, Owner) [13586]	Policy VC ROC1: Land south of New Inn Hill	Policy VC ROC1: Land south of New Inn Hill	<p>The Landowners are jointly promoting the site for residential development of approximately 25 residential units and open space and associated access, services and infrastructure.</p> <p>The Landowners intend to continue to promote the site through the Development Plan process. Once the site is formally allocated in the Adopted VCHAPs document assumed to be in 2025, the Landowners will conclude negotiations with prospective developers/purchasers.</p> <p>The site will then pass into the hands of a developer who will prepare and submit a planning application and ultimately deliver the scheme.</p> <p>The Landowners consider that the Local Plan (as it applies to VCROC1) is legally compliant, sound and complies with the duty to co-operate.</p> <p>The Landowners confirm that Site VCROC1 remains available for development and that they will continue to work together to bring the site forward for residential development. A Delivery Statement for the site has been completed and is submitted with this representation.</p> <p>The Delivery Statement confirms that the site remains available and suitable for development and deliverable taking into account the general and site-specific Policy requirements.</p> <p>The Landowners note and take seriously previously raised</p>		Appearance at Examination	To support the proposed allocation of VCROC1 and answer any questions posed by the Inspector or that may arise during the Plan's examination.	Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1757	John Long VCROC1 - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stg
----------------------	---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------	---	---------	-----	-----	-----	------	--

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
					<p>concerns over certain matters related to the site's allocation, particularly heritage impacts and highway safety.</p> <p>The Landowners have commissioned their own heritage advice to better understand the potential heritage impacts of a future scheme and likely mitigation measures.</p> <p>The landowners have also commissioned their own highway advice to confirm that the site can be adequately accessed and the necessary visibility splays can be achieved. This information will be submitted to the Plan's examination as part of the Written Hearing Statements in due course.</p>									
4108	Mrs Julie Church [19497]		Policy VC ROC1: Land south of New Inn Hill	Policy VC ROC1: Land south of New Inn Hill	The recent HIA appraisal carried out by the council is incorrect as it fails to recognise the presence, significance and positioning of a listed building which lies adjacent to the site. This is in contravention of the NPPF guidance. Decisions are therefore being made on the basis of an unsound evidence base. The "open space" being proposed is not sufficient to protect the heritage assets bearing in mind their relationship to the adjacent land. This is proven by attached evidence.	See attached document.	Appearance at Examination	The proposed development would harm our home in every way possible and would fail to protect it as an important heritage asset.	Object	No	No	No	1762	Objection 7:10:24.docx - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stj23.12.RocklandStMary.Final.pdf - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stk
4142	Environment Agency (Alasdair Hain-Cole, Planning Officer) [20421]		Policy VC ROC1: Land south of New Inn Hill	Policy VC ROC1: Land south of New Inn Hill	We request the requirement for "Early engagement with Anglian Water regarding the need to phase development within the catchment of Whitlingham Water Recycling Centre" is retained in the policy wording of VC ROC1.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1760	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4178	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		Policy VC ROC1: Land south of New Inn Hill	Policy VC ROC1: Land south of New Inn Hill	<p>Anglian Water notes the statement regarding potential phasing of this site beyond the early years of the Plan given that it is located within the catchment of Whitlingham WRC. Anglian Water has a proposed growth scheme to increase dry weather flow capacity at Whitlingham WRC within our PR24 Business Plan for delivery in AMP8 (2025-2030). However, this is subject to final determination our Business Plan by Ofwat, which is due in December 2024. Whitlingham WRC has been identified as a nutrient significant plant and will require phosphate and nitrogen removal upgrades to technically achievable levels (TAL) by 1st April 2030. An accelerated infrastructure delivery scheme will deliver the phosphate upgrade to TAL by 31st March 2027. This will reduce the amount of nutrient mitigation required for developments occupied after these dates.</p> <p>It is noted that the policy requirement for early engagement with Anglian Water has been removed from the policy and is only referred to in the text. We have no objection to the removal of this clause.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1761	<p>Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3v</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4193	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19732]		Policy VC ROC1: Land south of New Inn Hill	Policy VC ROC1: Land south of New Inn Hill	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, three grade II listed buildings (Old Hall and two barns) lie around the western end of the site. We therefore have concerns about built development on the western end of the site.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome paragraph 7.14 of the supporting text and criterion 5 of the policy which seek to respect the setting of the heritage assets through the provision of open space and preservation of long views.</p> <p>Amend archaeology criterion to read</p> <p>Norfolk's Historic Environment Service is to be consulted prior to application to determine the need for any archaeological assessments.</p>	Amend criterion in relation to archaeology to read:	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1756	<p>Historic England Representation Letter - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssx</p> <p>Historic England Representation Table - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssj</p>
3961	Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Sarah Eglington, Planning and Advocacy Advisor) [20410]		VC SPO1REV, 8.6	VC SPO1REV, 34.6	We support the text in paragraph 8.6 specifying the need to retain hedgerows and trees.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1763	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
<u>4001</u>	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19732]		VC SPO1REV, 8.9	VC SPO1REV, 34.9	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies immediately to the north east of the grade II listed property, The Orchards. Therefore, any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the significance of this heritage asset. We appreciate that the property is well screened by existing landscaping.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome paragraph 8.9 and the second bullet point of the policy in relation to strengthening boundary vegetation.</p> <p>We suggest a slight amendment to the wording to read ‘...wider landscape and to protect the significance of the setting of The Orchards to the south of the site’ because it’s the significance of the asset, not its setting.</p>	Amend wording to read: ‘...wider landscape and to protect the significance of the setting of The Orchards to the south of the site’	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1764	<p>Historic England Representation Letter - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssx</p> <p>Historic England Representation Table - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssj</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3943	NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (Mr Thomas Clare, ICS Estates Planning Liaison and Policy Lead) [20478]		Policy VC SPO1REV: Land west of Bunwell Road	Policy VC SPO1REV: Land west of Bunwell Road	The ambulance service, EEAST, are in a unique position that intersects health, transport and community safety and does not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development combined with other developments in the vicinity. This development is likely to increase demand upon existing constrained ambulance services and nationally set blue light response times. The capital required through developer contribution would form a proportion of the required funding for the provision of capacity to absorb the patient growth and demand generated by this development. Any funding would be used towards the capital cost of providing new additional ambulances and/or new additional medical equipment, which for an ambulance service is their physical infrastructure, and/or new additional parking space(s) for ambulances at existing ambulance stations.	None specified. ICS would encourage continued working with LPA.	Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1856	NHS ICS Response - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3g

4022	Network Rail Ltd (Mr David Brierley) [20488]		Policy VC SPO1REV: Land west of Bunwell Road	Policy VC SPO1REV: Land west of Bunwell Road	<p>NR has provided both important general and site-specific comments on the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan – Regulation 19 Pre-submission Addendum.</p> <p>For future development schemes in the South Norfolk area, NR requires that if any new infrastructure requirements affect NR and the operational railway then the appropriate agreements must be entered into by the promoters.</p> <p>NR has a key requirement to manage risk appropriately for all rail infrastructure on safety grounds, to reduce risk so that it is as low as reasonably practicable. NR also requests that any developer and other key stakeholders engage with us early to discuss opportunities and enter into the necessary agreements.</p> <p>Nearby Level Crossing(s), including Spooner Row – Impact Assessment(s) Required and Improvements Requests</p> <p>Developer(s) to provide a transport assessment to show blocking back across level crossings and other effects, including at Spooner Row. NR is happy to discuss with developer before commissioning to ensure right things are covered.</p> <p>It should not be assumed that development sites will not have any impact and thus should not be allocated favourable in policy for any residential or mix-use allocation with this assumption. Unless it is supported by and of benefit to the railway undertaker or is confirmed to be of no notable detrimental impact to</p>	<p>Network Rail request the policy be changed and updated to include our railway concerns.</p> <p>Nearby Level Crossing(s), including Spooner Row – Impact Assessment(s) Required and Improvements Requests</p> <p>Developer(s) to provide a transport assessment to show blocking back across level crossings and other effects, including at Spooner Row.</p>	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1881	
------	--	--	--	--	--	---	---------------	--	--------	----	----	----	------	--

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
					<p>the railway.</p> <p>NR believe the policy is unsound as it is not ‘positively prepared’ because there is no consideration of safety and other concerns. The plan is not ‘justified’ as there is no appropriate strategy or proportionate evidence to determine why these railway factors are discounted in policy.</p> <p>Challenge of ‘soundness’ is even more pertinent as there are considerations in ‘Policies VC-SPO 1 - 4’ on highways and Anglia Water, yet there is no reflection of very similar railway requirements. This proposal does not demonstrate that the “area’s objectively assessed needs” have been met regarding sustainable public transport.</p>									
4144	Environment Agency (Alasdair Hain-Cole, Planning Officer) [20421]		Policy VC SPO1REV: Land west of Bunwell Road	Policy VC SPO1REV: Land west of Bunwell Road	We are satisfied to see “Early engagement with Anglian Water (AW) regarding connecting to the local water recycling network” listed as a developer requirement in the policy text for VC SPO1REV and VC SPO2.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1765	
4179	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		Policy VC SPO1REV: Land west of Bunwell Road	Policy VC SPO1REV: Land west of Bunwell Road	Due to the very small WRC at School Lane Spooner Row that is subject to a descriptive permit, and the limited capacity of these small works to accommodate significant growth, we agree with the need for early engagement to assess the feasibility of a wastewater connection. See also our commentary on the Water Cycle Study.		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1766	Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s3v

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4204	KCS Development Ltd [19681]	Cara Chambers [20476]	Policy VC SPO1REV: Land west of Bunwell Road	Policy VC SPO1REV: Land west of Bunwell Road	<p>The Outline planning application for up to 45 dwellings was submitted in March 2024 (reference 2024/0879) and is subject to ongoing and positive discussions with the council.</p> <p>Details of matters of access, layout, and landscaping were submitted for approval, meaning only scale and appearance remain for future Reserved Matters.</p> <p>The planning application was informed by detailed pre-application discussions with the council and stakeholders and the submitted details reflect the pre-application advice provided by the council. Furthermore, public consultation was undertaken and involved liaison with Spooner, Sutton and Wattlefield Community Council as well as consultation with local residents.</p> <p>In the post-submission stage of the outline application, a variety of consultee comments have been received which raise no insurmountable issues and provide positive feedback on layout and design matters.</p> <p>The ongoing Outline application demonstrates the site is entirely suitable and deliverable, and can make a meaningful contribution to the council's immediate housing land supply.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1786	KCS Development - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s3f

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4206	KCS Development Ltd [19681]	Cara Chambers [20476]	Policy VC SPO1REV: Land west of Bunwell Road	Policy VC SPO1REV: Land west of Bunwell Road	<p>As part of the evidence base, an updated Site Assessments document for the latest Regulation 19 Pre-submission Addendum is provided. There are no changes to the Site Assessment of SPO1, and we agree with the continued robust conclusions that the site is suitable, available, achievable and deliverable.</p> <p>The site is not subject to any 'absolute constraints' as listed in the Site Assessment and the development area is free of any notable constraints.</p> <p>Any 'Amber' constraints identified through the Site Assessment can be mitigated.</p> <p>Nutrient Neutrality does not present an obstacle to development. There are opportunities for onsite mitigation within the land to the north which can also provide additional nutrient credits for other sites in the area.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1786	<p>KCS Development - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s3f</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4207	KCS Development Ltd [19681]	Cara Chambers [20476]	Policy VC SPO1REV: Land west of Bunwell Road	Policy VC SPO1REV: Land west of Bunwell Road	<p>Support the allocation of the site for housing and in particular the principle of a larger allocation which takes in the entire developable area.</p> <p>However, the developable area of the site can accommodate approximately 45 units and the plan should be updated accordingly.</p> <p>The quantum proposed in the draft policy (35 units), while supported, would still result in an inefficient use of a sustainable site, whereas a development of approximately 45 units could be delivered and make a more efficient use of available land. This is acknowledged in the evidence base, specifically the Sustainability Appraisal. Therefore, the draft site specific policy should recognise that approximately 45 dwellings can be delivered.</p> <p>Furthermore, the red line of the allocation should be expanded to include the adjacent areas of higher flood risk to the north-east of the site. Mitigation methods on this land can then be used within the allocation red line to aid with the nutrient neutrality credentials of the site and surrounding area alongside flood risk mitigation.</p> <p>The pre-application advice request and recently submitted planning application demonstrates that a larger allocation of 45 dwellings is entirely sound, appropriate and deliverable.</p>	The draft site specific policy should recognise that approximately 45 dwellings can be delivered.	Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1786	KCS Development - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s3f

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3944	NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (Mr Thomas Clare, ICS Estates Planning Liaison and Policy Lead) [20478]		Policy VC SPO2: South of Station Road	Policy VC SPO2: South of Station Road	The ambulance service, EEAST, are in a unique position that intersects health, transport and community safety and does not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development combined with other developments in the vicinity. This development is likely to increase demand upon existing constrained ambulance services and nationally set blue light response times. The capital required through developer contribution would form a proportion of the required funding for the provision of capacity to absorb the patient growth and demand generated by this development. Any funding would be used towards the capital cost of providing new additional ambulances and/or new additional medical equipment, which for an ambulance service is their physical infrastructure, and/or new additional parking space(s) for ambulances at existing ambulance stations.	None specified. ICS would encourage continued working with LPA.	Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1857	NHS ICS Response - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3g

4023	Network Rail Ltd (Mr David Brierley) [20488]		Policy VC SPO2: South of Station Road	Policy VC SPO2: South of Station Road	<p>NR has provided both important general and site-specific comments on the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan – Regulation 19 Pre-submission Addendum.</p> <p>For future development schemes in the South Norfolk area, NR requires that if any new infrastructure requirements affect NR and the operational railway then the appropriate agreements must be entered into by the promoters.</p> <p>NR has a key requirement to manage risk appropriately for all rail infrastructure on safety grounds, to reduce risk so that it is as low as reasonably practicable. NR also requests that any developer and other key stakeholders engage with us early to discuss opportunities and enter into the necessary agreements.</p> <p>Nearby Level Crossing(s), including Spooner Row – Impact Assessment(s) Required and Improvements Requests</p> <p>Developer(s) to provide a transport assessment to show blocking back across level crossings and other effects, including at Spooner Row. NR is happy to discuss with developer before commissioning to ensure right things are covered.</p> <p>It should not be assumed that development sites will not have any impact and thus should not be allocated favourable in policy for any residential or mix-use allocation with this assumption. Unless it is supported by and of benefit to the railway undertaker or is confirmed to be of no notable detrimental impact to</p>	<p>Network Rail request the policy be changed and updated to include our railway concerns.</p> <p>Nearby Level Crossing(s), including Spooner Row – Impact Assessment(s) Required and Improvements Requests</p> <p>Developer(s) to provide a transport assessment to show blocking back across level crossings and other effects, including at Spooner Row.</p>	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1882	
------	--	--	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	---	---------------	--	--------	----	----	----	------	--

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
					<p>the railway.</p> <p>NR believe the policy is unsound as it is not ‘positively prepared’ because there is no consideration of safety and other concerns. The plan is not ‘justified’ as there is no appropriate strategy or proportionate evidence to determine why these railway factors are discounted in policy.</p> <p>Challenge of ‘soundness’ is even more pertinent as there are considerations in ‘Policies VC-SPO 1 - 4’ on highways and Anglia Water, yet there is no reflection of very similar railway requirements. This proposal does not demonstrate that the “area’s objectively assessed needs” have been met regarding sustainable public transport.</p>									
4105	Water Management Alliance (Ms Phillipa Nanson, Sustainable Development Officer) [20327]		Policy VC SPO2: South of Station Road	Policy VC SPO2: South of Station Road	Major development - If surface water discharges within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD, we request that this discharge is facilitated in line with the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1767	Water Management Alliance - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/stx
4180	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		Policy VC SPO2: South of Station Road	Policy VC SPO2: South of Station Road	Due to the very small WRC at School Lane Spooner Row that is subject to a descriptive permit, and the limited capacity of these small works to accommodate significant growth, we agree with the need for early engagement to assess the feasibility of a wastewater connection. See also our commentary on the Water Cycle Study.		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1768	Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3v

4024	Network Rail Ltd (Mr David Brierley) [20488]		Policy VC SPO3: Land at School Lane	Policy VC SPO3: Land at School Lane	<p>NR has provided both important general and site-specific comments on the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan – Regulation 19 Pre-submission Addendum.</p> <p>For future development schemes in the South Norfolk area, NR requires that if any new infrastructure requirements affect NR and the operational railway then the appropriate agreements must be entered into by the promoters.</p> <p>NR has a key requirement to manage risk appropriately for all rail infrastructure on safety grounds, to reduce risk so that it is as low as reasonably practicable. NR also requests that any developer and other key stakeholders engage with us early to discuss opportunities and enter into the necessary agreements.</p> <p>Nearby Level Crossing(s), including Spooner Row – Impact Assessment(s) Required and Improvements Requests</p> <p>Developer(s) to provide a transport assessment to show blocking back across level crossings and other effects, including at Spooner Row. NR is happy to discuss with developer before commissioning to ensure right things are covered.</p> <p>It should not be assumed that development sites will not have any impact and thus should not be allocated favourable in policy for any residential or mix-use allocation with this assumption. Unless it is supported by and of benefit to the railway undertaker or is confirmed to be of no notable detrimental impact to</p>	<p>Network Rail request the policy be changed and updated to include our railway concerns.</p> <p>Nearby Level Crossing(s), including Spooner Row – Impact Assessment(s) Required and Improvements Requests</p> <p>Developer(s) to provide a transport assessment to show blocking back across level crossings and other effects, including at Spooner Row.</p>	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1883	
------	--	--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	---	---------------	--	--------	----	----	----	------	--

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
					<p>the railway.</p> <p>NR believe the policy is unsound as it is not ‘positively prepared’ because there is no consideration of safety and other concerns. The plan is not ‘justified’ as there is no appropriate strategy or proportionate evidence to determine why these railway factors are discounted in policy.</p> <p>Challenge of ‘soundness’ is even more pertinent as there are considerations in ‘Policies VC-SPO 1 - 4’ on highways and Anglia Water, yet there is no reflection of very similar railway requirements. This proposal does not demonstrate that the “area’s objectively assessed needs” have been met regarding sustainable public transport.</p>									
3927	Crimson Development Homes [20475]	Lanpro Services Ltd (Mr Tom Lomas, Planner) [20474]	Policy VC TAC1REV: Land to the west of Norwich Road	Policy VC TAC1REV: Land to the west of Norwich Road	It is proposed to get a pre-application enquiry completed with AW in order to ensure there is adequate capacity, or capacity can be made in the local WRC. Additionally, a Site Promoter Delivery Statement Form has been completed in support of the Policy.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1769	Site Promoter Delivery Statement Form_VC TAC1REV_Final.pdf - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ss7
3962	Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Sarah Eglington, Planning and Advocacy Advisor) [20410]		Policy VC TAC1REV: Land to the west of Norwich Road	Policy VC TAC1REV: Land to the west of Norwich Road	We object to the removal of the text around the protection of the horse chestnut tree	We recommend that the text around the protection of the horse chestnut tree which has been deleted from this policy be reinstated.	Written Representation		Object	No	No	No	1788	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4145	Environment Agency (Alasdair Hain-Cole, Planning Officer) [20421]		Policy VC TAC1REV: Land to the west of Norwich Road	Policy VC TAC1REV: Land to the west of Norwich Road	Current data shows limited capacity at Forncett End WRC. It is not clear why reference to this has been removed from paragraph 9.12. Nevertheless, we are satisfied that policies VC TAC1REV and VC TAC2 both include the requirement for “early engagement with Anglian Water (AW) to ensure that there is adequate capacity, or capacity can be made available, in the local Water Recycling Centre (WRC).”		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1770	
4181	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		Policy VC TAC1REV: Land to the west of Norwich Road	Policy VC TAC1REV: Land to the west of Norwich Road	<p>We support the policy requirement for early engagement with Anglian Water. As already identified in our response to the planning application currently pending decision on this site, there is currently headroom available at Forncett-Forncett End WRC to accommodate wastewater flows from the site.</p> <p>Forncett-Forncett End WRC has been identified as a nutrient significant plant and will require phosphate and nitrogen removal upgrades to technically achievable levels by 1st April 2030. This will reduce the amount of nutrient mitigation required for developments occupied after this date.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1771	<p>Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3v</p>
4211	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19732]		Policy VC TAC1REV: Land to the west of Norwich Road	Policy VC TAC1REV: Land to the west of Norwich Road	<p>Whilst criterion 2 refers to boundary treatments to the south of the site, the HIA recommends planting along the eastern boundary of the development as mitigation for the non-designated heritage asset, Weaver’s Cottage. We therefore recommend that the policy wording of criterion 2 is amended to read</p> <p>‘Appropriate boundary treatments to the south and east of the site...’</p>	<p>Amend criterion 2 to read:</p> <p>‘Appropriate boundary treatments to the south and east of the site...’</p>	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1880	<p>Historic England Representation Letter - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssx</p> <p>Historic England Representation Table - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssj</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4182	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		Policy VC TAC2: Land adjacent The Fields	Policy VC TAC2: Land adjacent The Fields	<p>We support the policy requirement for early engagement with Anglian Water. As already identified in our response to the planning application currently pending decision on this site, there is currently headroom available at Forncett-Forncett End WRC to accommodate wastewater flows from the site.</p> <p>Forncett-Forncett End WRC has been identified as a nutrient significant plant and will require phosphate and nitrogen removal upgrades to technically achievable levels by 1st April 2030. This will reduce the amount of nutrient mitigation required for developments occupied after this date.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1772	<p>Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3v</p>
3852	Tasburgh Parish Council (Tasburgh Parish Clerk) [13006]		VC TAS1REV, 10.4	VC TAS1REV, 38.4	Supportive in the reduction from 25-20		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1777	
3853	Tasburgh Parish Council (Tasburgh Parish Clerk) [13006]		VC TAS1REV, 10.10	VC TAS1REV, 38.10	No additional comments		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1778	

3993	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19732]		Policy VC TAS1REV: North of Church Road	Policy VC TAS1REV: North of Church Road	<p>While there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the grade II listed Old Hall Farmhouse lies immediately to the north west of the site. In addition, the scheduled monument (a hillfort, known as ‘Camp in Village’), lies to the north of the site, which also includes the grade I listed Church of St Mary, and grade II listed war memorial and Rectory. Therefore, any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the significance of these heritage assets. We are particularly concerned about the potential impacts on the Farmhouse, given its proximity.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We note that the capacity of the site has been reduced from 25 to 20 dwellings which is welcomed.</p> <p>We note that criterion 2 refers to protecting views across the north of the site. Whilst this is not exactly what we had previously suggested (we had suggested an area of open space/orchard/playing field in the north eastern third of the site), we welcome this proposed change and recognise that this is helpful in signalling the importance of protecting the setting of the GII listed Old Hall Farmhouse.</p> <p>We broadly welcome criterion 4 which recognises the archaeological sensitivity of the area. We suggest a very slight amendment to read:</p> <p>Norfolk Historic Environment Service to be engaged at an early stage and planning applications supported by archaeological</p>	Amend criterion 4 to read	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1779	Historic England Representation Letter - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssx Historic England Representation Table - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/ssj
------	---	--	---	---	--	---------------------------	---------------	--	--------	-----	----	-----	------	--

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
					assessment, including the results of field evaluation where appropriate;									
4161	Mr Andrew Lansdell [19866]		Policy VC TAS1REV: North of Church Road	Policy VC TAS1REV: North of Church Road	<p>I object to the reduction of 5 in the numbers proposed, from the previous number proposed of 25.</p> <p>I object to the requirement to set aside land for the future expansion of Preston VC CE Primary School, as the Local Education Authority has stated they have no plans to expand the school and no requirement for additional land for that purpose.</p>	<p>Revert to the number previously proposed and allocate the land for approx 25 dwellings.</p> <p>Remove the requirement to set aside land for the future expansion of Preston VC CE Primary School.</p>	Written Representation		Object	Yes	Yes	Yes	1781	
4183	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		Policy VC TAS1REV: North of Church Road	Policy VC TAS1REV: North of Church Road	No comments.		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1780	<p>Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3v</p>

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3848	Mrs Sallyann Weston [19134]		VC WIC1REV	VC WIC1REV	<p>The granting of planning permission on this site, for any number of houses, will have a significant impact on the open countryside views that are currently enjoyed by all.</p> <p>In addition the village school is already oversubscribed with parents driving from Wymondham and because of inadequate parking vehicles are parked badly around The Green/Hackford Road junction, blocking visibility and increasing danger for road users and pedestrians.</p>	This is not a suitable location for large scale development. Housing allocation should be small scale, infill, development.	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1785	

3860	Wicklewood Parish Council (Wicklewood Parish Clerk) [17040]		VC WIC1REV	VC WIC1REV	<p>Wicklewood Parish Council objects: In the current plan it states Hackford and Wymondham Roads benefit from extensive views of the surrounding countryside. This fact has been removed from Reg 19 statement. The landscape has not changed. Accurate descriptions should not be changed. Concerns about the flooding potential. Water from this site would threaten Wicklewood Mere, an SSL. Milestone Lane is not on main sewer, additional ground water would impact their septic tanks. There are concerns about the scale of the development in a village of just 407 properties. Extra traffic on narrow lanes, lack of facilities and capacity at school</p>	<p>Wicklewood Parish Council objects to this proposed allocation:</p> <p>In the current plan it states that Hackford and Wymondham Roads benefit from extensive views of the surrounding countryside. This fact has been deliberately removed from the Reg 19 statement as it does not support the site allocations VC WIC1. The landscape has not changed between version 18 and 19, so neither should the description of Wicklewood. It is wrong and misleading to remove accurate descriptions just because they do not fit with the new plans. Previous planning applications in this area have been refused on the grounds of obstructing these views. Here is the full history of the official description of this area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1996 – This plan says, “a particular feature is the large open area of land bounded by development on Church Lane, Wymondham Road and High Street” and “the large central open area and good views from within the village of the surrounding countryside all contribute to the rural character of the village”. • 2003 – No Wicklewood specific section because they severely restricted development in rural villages in this plan. Wicklewood is mentioned under HOU 6 with a few other villages where development was “i) limited to small scale developments of not more than 10 dwellings; and ii) Singly or cumulatively, the development would be in keeping with the form and 	Appearance at Examination	To represent the views of the Parish Council	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1785	
------	---	--	------------	------------	---	--	---------------------------	--	--------	-----	----	-----	------	--

[illegible]

[illegible]

3861	Wicklewood Parish Council (Wicklewood Parish Clerk) [17040]		VC WIC1REV	VC WIC1REV	<p>Wicklewood Parish Council objects: In the current plan it states Hackford and Wymondham Roads benefit from extensive views of the surrounding countryside. This fact has been removed from Reg 19 statement. The landscape has not changed. Accurate descriptions should not be changed. Concerns about the flooding potential. Water from this site would threaten Wicklewood Mere, an SSL. Milestone Lane is not on main sewer, additional ground water would impact their septic tanks. There are concerns about the scale of the development in a village of just 407 properties. Extra traffic on narrow lanes, lack of facilities and capacity at school</p>	<p>In the current plan and Reg 18 it states that Hackford and Wymondham Roads benefit from extensive views of the surrounding countryside. This fact has been deliberately removed from the Reg 19 statement as it does not support the site allocations VC WIC1REV. The landscape has not changed between version 18 and 19, so neither should the description of Wicklewood. It is wrong and misleading to remove accurate descriptions just because they do not fit with the new plans. Previous planning applications in this area have been refused on the grounds of obstructing these views. Here is the full history of the official description of this area:</p> <p>• 1996 – This plan says, “a particular feature is the large open area of land bounded by development on Church Lane, Wymondham Road and High Street” and “the large central open area and good views from within the village of the surrounding countryside all contribute to the rural character of the village”.</p> <p>• 2003 – No Wicklewood specific section because they severely restricted development in rural villages in this plan. Wicklewood is mentioned under HOU 6 with a few other villages where development was “i) limited to small scale developments of not more than 10 dwellings; and ii) Singly or cumulatively, the development would be in keeping with the form and character of the village and its setting.</p>	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1785	
------	---	--	------------	------------	---	---	------------------------	--	--------	-----	----	-----	------	--

[illegible]

						<p>It should also be noted that South Norfolk Landscape Character Assessments Character Area: E3 – Hingham - Mattishall Plateau Farmland, which covers this area states. Large, geometric arable fields are the dominant land cover. From the most elevated areas, for example at High Oak, views to churches within the character area (at Wicklewood and Deopham) and outside the character area (at Hackford) are significant.</p> <p>This site has been rejected at previous Local Plans due to it being “less well related to the settlement pattern, being on the opposite side of the road to the main village” and “the site provides open views across the plateau farmland and subdividing it to provide a small amount of housing would affect the setting of the village”.</p> <p>There are serious concerns about the flooding potential of this development. There is already flooding in the area around The Green and Primrose Farm. Water flowing from this site would threaten the nearby Wicklewood Mere which is an SSI. The properties along Milestone Lane are not on main sewers and the additional ground water would impact on their septic tanks. We have also recently had confirmation from Anglian Water that the Wicklewood Pumping Station does not have sufficient capacity to get tankers on site quickly</p>								
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>enough to prevent overspill into the river if the pumps fail. Although a generator has recently been installed, this only deals with power failure and would not address any mechanical failure.</p> <p>Wicklewood currently has a tax base of just 407 properties. To add another 52 properties is development out of proportion with the size of the village. There are concerns about the additional traffic movements that will be generated on narrow country lanes where there are few pavements. In the description it states that there is a good range of facilities including a primary school, village hall, recreation field and pub. The work 'including' would imply that there are more facilities, however there are not. There is no shop, Post Office, surgery or any other facilities to support this additional housing. The local school generally runs at virtually full capacity and currently has very few spaces which will not be sufficient to take the extra primary school children anticipated for this size development which could increase the village population by almost 13% and schools in neighbouring Wymondham are also full. There is also no availability for doctor, dentist or vets in the area, all of the current practices in Wymondham are at full capacity.</p> <p>Just recently there has been issue with discharge from the sewerage pumping station at</p>								
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
						Wicklewood into the river due to retention capacity and tankers not able to respond within the retention time during a fault. The capacity of the holding tank has not been increased since it was originally constructed circa 1980 with many new properties added since then and the village of Morley now feeding into this pumping station. Pungent smells have been reported from this site.								
3902	Mr John Lowe [19349]		VC WIC1REV	VC WIC1REV	<p>The proposed increase in the number of houses suggested could be built on this land will only add to overall main concern of villagers that this development will destroy forever a prominent and highly attractive vista</p> <p>enjoyed by not only local people but many travellers using Hackford road.</p> <p>This is not NIMBYism but a plea to those in power to listen and accept the damage that this development will have on this unique landscape.</p>	<p>Allocate these dwellings to alternative less contentious sites that</p> <p>are better suited regarding the massive negative impact on the landscape.</p>	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1785	
3966	Mr James Braybrook [19362]		VC WIC1REV	VC WIC1REV	<p>Destruction of green belt, proposed number of houses way too many for small village with limited services and already stretched infrastructure.</p>	<p>Plenty of other sites within the village for infill house building rather than adding a mini estate and destroying the countryside.</p>	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1785	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3994	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19732]		VC WIC1REV	VC WIC1REV	No comments.	None stated.	Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1773	Historic England Representation Letter - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssx Historic England Representation Table - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssj
4032	Ms Sue Knights [19479]		VC WIC1REV	VC WIC1REV	<p>Proposed development to this open countryside which marks the natural landscape within the village, would destroy the open views that are enjoyed by all living in the village or travelling through. This view offers a sense of peace and enjoyment to all.</p> <p>The proposed 40 homes will add to traffic congestion on the rural roads leading to A11, Wymondham College and Wymondham town.</p> <p>Other small estate - type developments stated are much smaller in comparison to the proposed 40 houses and were built within the village without taking away the village countryside.</p>	<p>This is not a site which would benefit from being developed. It would destroy the rural sense of the village and the beauty of the area. The proposed housing development is not in character with any nearby housing or with the rest of the village.</p> <p>Wicklewood is in threat of losing its uniqueness and becoming a copy of urban sprawl.</p>	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1785	
4115	Mr Chris Baines [19409]		VC WIC1REV	VC WIC1REV	<p>This proposed site has in the past been turned down, in part due to the views of the countryside when entering the village from the East. The Regulation document 2018 states, in the Form & Character statement, that Wymondham Road and Hackford Road benefit from extensive views of the countryside. In the current Regulation document this phrase has been removed. Why? The form & character of the village has not changed in this respect. I can only suspect that this has been deliberately removed to make agreement to this development more likely. Pecunia.</p>	Removal of the development from the plan.	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1785	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4184	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		VC WIC1REV	VC WIC1REV	<p>We support the addition of the clause to ensure early engagement with Anglian Water regarding our infrastructure within the site.</p> <p>Wymondham WRC has been identified as a nutrient significant plant and will require phosphate and nitrogen removal upgrades to technically achievable levels by 1st April 2030. This will reduce the amount of nutrient mitigation required for developments occupied after this date.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1784	<p>Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3v</p>

4192	Cllr Richard Elliott (SNC Councillor) [20442]		VC WIC1REV	VC WIC1REV	<p>Flooding</p> <p>Surface water flooding is a major concern and indeed discussion with stakeholders over mitigation in all these villages has been ongoing, in the case of Barford and Wicklewood for a considerable time.</p> <p>I want to ensure that in your deliberations the existing problems of surface water flooding and the potential for making things worse has been properly considered.</p> <p>Any doubts over the impact that further large scale development in these villages will have on surface water flooding should rule out these sites. In my opinion it is no coincidence that large scale development in North Wymondham has had an adverse effect on the River Tiffey, causing additional pressures downstream in Barford and Wrampingham.</p> <p>Scale, Density and Protecting the Rural Landscape</p> <p>I must stress that I am not in any way against some appropriate development in rural villages.</p> <p>However, increasing housing in a concentration of relatively small villages north of Wymondham over a relatively short time, will in my view have the potential to damage the rural character, important landscapes and nature of these communities. This is made more serious when the necessary infrastructure (health care, education, retail, transport) to support this growth either lags behind construction</p>		Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1785	
------	---	--	------------	------------	--	--	---------------	--	--------	-----	----	-----	------	--

[illegible]

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4209	NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (Mr Thomas Clare, ICS Estates Planning Liaison and Policy Lead) [20478]		VC WIC1REV	VC WIC1REV	The ambulance service, EEASt, are in a unique position that intersects health, transport and community safety and does not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development combined with other developments in the vicinity. This development is likely to increase demand upon existing constrained ambulance services and nationally set blue light response times. The capital required through developer contribution would form a proportion of the required funding for the provision of capacity to absorb the patient growth and demand generated by this development. Any funding would be used towards the capital cost of providing new additional ambulances and/or new additional medical equipment, which for an ambulance service is their physical infrastructure, and/or new additional parking space(s) for ambulances at existing ambulance stations.	None specified. ICB encourages continued working with the LPA.	Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1858	NHS ICS Response - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3g
3887	Mr John Lowe [19349]		VC WIC1REV, 11.6	VC WIC1REV, 45.6	"The site is in a prominent location on the approach to the village..." SNDC's own words. Yes it is prominent and as such will stick out like a sore thumb. Adding 10 more houses will make the situation worse.	The plan needs to be cancelled.	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1859	IMG_3347.jpg - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s45
3963	Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Dr Sarah Eglinton, Planning and Advocacy Advisor) [20410]		VC WIC1REV, 11.6	VC WIC1REV, 45.6	We support the text starting “as well as the retention and the reinforcement of the existing natural boundaries to the north and south of the site”		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1776	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4033	Ms Sue Knights [19479]		VC WIC1REV, 11.6	VC WIC1REV, 45.6	<p>No careful development will prevent the loss of the rural views of this proposed site. The village gateway mentioned is currently a village sign with flowers on a small green. A housing estate sitting solely on the edge of the village will not give a rural gateway. Already this Green area is used by cars parking for the school and spoiling the grass into a mud track.</p> <p>To suggest a large housing development on this land, with now a proposed further 10 homes, total of 40 is totally disproportionate to any existing development and the total size of the village.</p>	<p>The village will not benefit from a large housing estate. Any additional housing required should be planned as infills within the village.</p> <p>To suggest a further 10 houses on the proposed 30 homes indicates the opening for further housing to be added to this in the future. The field proposed for this development has further acreage that potentially could add even more homes.</p>	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1859	
4107	Mr Chris Baines [19409]		VC WIC1REV, 11.6	VC WIC1REV, 45.6	<p>A development of this size is too big for Wicklewood. Wicklewood has no shop, no Post Office and virtually no employment opportunities.</p> <p>It is outside the agreed development boundary and would be detached from the rest of the village.</p> <p>The Green is a narrow country lane and not a suitable road for access. Even if the widening to the North takes place, what about increased traffic travelling to the South, the direct route to Wymondham College and the A11. Not everyone will travel North!</p> <p>The School in the village is already at capacity.</p> <p>Loss of high grade agricultural land.</p>	Removal from the plan.	Appearance at Examination	Full facts to be given before any decision is made, not just those to suit SNDC.	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1859	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4128	Ms Sue Knights [19479]		VC WIC1REV, 11.6	VC WIC1REV, 45.6	<p>This recognises the site is within a prominent plateau. This stated, the revised plan will no longer equate to a smaller area of a larger agricultural field but to incorporate the eastern section of a larger agricultural field.</p> <p>Retention and the reinforcement of the existing natural boundaries would be essential but will not offer and protect the far reaching views this area currently provides.</p>	<p>The proposed development area is too large for its position in the village and countryside.</p> <p>Retention and the reinforcement of the existing natural boundaries would be essential but will not offer and protect the far reaching views this area currently provides.</p>	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1783	
4034	Ms Sue Knights [19479]		VC WIC1REV, 11.8	VC WIC1REV, 45.8	<p>The roads around the proposed development site floods when heavy rain falls.</p>	Reconsideration of site for development and number of housing being proposed.	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1775	
4102	Mr Chris Baines [19409]		VC WIC1REV, 11.8	VC WIC1REV, 45.8	<p>How can flooding have been identified, both historically and current but not be considered important enough to prevent development. The whole site has been subject to flooding over the last 6 -12 months. This is only likely to get worse as our climate changes. To simply dismiss it is very crass.</p>	Removal of this site from the plan.	Appearance at Examination	In order that the full facts be highlighted before any decision is made	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1775	
4112	Water Management Alliance (Ms Phillipa Nanson, Sustainable Development Officer) [20327]		VC WIC1REV, 11.8	VC WIC1REV, 45.8	<p>Major development - If surface water discharges within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD, we request that this discharge is facilitated in line with the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).</p>		Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1775	Water Management Alliance - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/stx
3849	Mrs Sallyann Weston [19134]		VC WIC1REV, 11.9	VC WIC1REV, 45.9	<p>The sewerage mains run behind the houses on the opposite side of the road, how would this development access the mains?</p> <p>The local pumping station regularly discharges into the river during bad weather as it is unable to cope, a large development will increase the pressure and presumably the amount/frequency of discharges</p>	Local pumping station and main station at Wymondham are already struggling to cope, area not suitable for large scale developments	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1782	

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3866	Wicklewood Parish Council (Wicklewood Parish Clerk) [17040]		VC WIC1REV, 11.9	VC WIC1REV, 45.9	Just recently there has been issue with discharge from the sewerage pumping station at Wicklewood into the river due to retention capacity and tankers not able to respond within the retention time during a fault. The capacity of the holding tank has not been increased since it was originally constructed circa 1980 with many new properties added since then and the village of Morley now feeding into this pumping station. Pungent smells have been reported from this site.	Just recently there has been issue with discharge from the sewerage pumping station at Wicklewood into the river due to retention capacity and tankers not able to respond within the retention time during a fault. The capacity of the holding tank has not been increased since it was originally constructed circa 1980 with many new properties added since then and the village of Morley now feeding into this pumping station. Pungent smells have been reported from this site.	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1782	
4103	Mr Chris Baines [19409]		VC WIC1REV, 11.9	VC WIC1REV, 45.9	There is frequent flooding in Wicklewood. The pumping station, located on the edge of the village, is not able to cope at the moment. The addition of 40 new dwellings will make this situation worse.	Removal of this development from the plan.	Appearance at Examination	So that full information is given before a decision is made.	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1782	
3890	Mr John Lowe [19349]		VC WIC1REV, 11.10	VC WIC1REV, 45.10	"This is considered a reasonable site area to ensure that landscaping of the site is appropriate to respond to the identified landscape constraints."?SNDC obviously recognise this is not really a suitable site! No amount of "appropriate " landscaping will make the destruction of a unique landscape anything but a tragedy to all those who currently enjoy such a special vista,	The plan needs to be cancelled. This is not Nimbyism, but a sensible request to allow this unique vista to be enjoyed by many local citizens and passing pedestrians and motorists.	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1860	IMG_3347.jpg - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s46
4104	Mr Chris Baines [19409]		VC WIC1REV, 11.10	VC WIC1REV, 45.10	The original proposal was for 30 dwellings on 1.63ha. The additional 10 dwellings were to be added on approx. 0.6ha. Why has the total land area for the 40 dwellings risen to 2.97ha? Either someone's maths not very good or the figure has been 'massaged'.	Look at the maths again!	Appearance at Examination	Question the total land area allocated to the 40 dwellings in relation to the initial 30 plus the additional 10. Maths doesn't add up.	Object	Yes	No	Yes	1774	

3867	Wicklewood Parish Council (Wicklewood Parish Clerk) [17040]		Policy VC WIC2: Land off Hackford Road	Policy VC WIC2: Land off Hackford Road	<p>Wicklewood Parish Council objects: In the current plan it states Hackford and Wymondham Roads benefit from extensive views of the surrounding countryside. This fact has been removed from Reg 19 statement. The landscape has not changed. Accurate descriptions should not be changed. Concerns about the flooding potential. Water from this site would threaten Wicklewood Mere, an SSI. Milestone Lane is not on main sewer, additional ground water would impact their septic tanks. There are concerns about the scale of the development in a village of just 407 properties. Extra traffic on narrow lanes, lack of facilities and capacity at school</p>	<p>Wicklewood Parish Council objects to this proposed allocation:</p> <p>In the current plan and Reg 18 it states that Hackford and Wymondham Roads benefit from extensive views of the surrounding countryside. This fact has been deliberately removed from the Reg 19 statement as it does not support the site allocations VC WIC2. The landscape has not changed between version 18 and 19, so neither should the description of Wicklewood. It is wrong and misleading to remove accurate descriptions just because they do not fit with the new plans. Previous planning applications in this area have been refused on the grounds of obstructing these views. Here is the full history of the official description of this area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1996 – This plan says, “a particular feature is the large open area of land bounded by development on Church Lane, Wymondham Road and High Street” and “the large central open area and good views from within the village of the surrounding countryside all contribute to the rural character of the village”. • 2003 – No Wicklewood specific section because they severely restricted development in rural villages in this plan. Wicklewood is mentioned under HOU 6 with a few other villages where development was “i) limited to small scale developments of not more than 10 dwellings; and ii) Singly or cumulatively, the development would be in keeping with the form and character of the village and its setting. 	Written Representation		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1863	
------	---	--	--	--	---	---	------------------------	--	--------	-----	----	-----	------	--

[illegible]

					<p>example at High Oak, views to churches within the character area (at Wicklewood and Deopham) and outside the character area (at Hackford) are significant.</p> <p>This site has been rejected at previous Local Plans due to it being “less well related to the settlement pattern, being on the opposite side of the road to the main village” and “the site provides open views across the plateau farmland and subdividing it to provide a small amount of housing would affect the setting of the village”.</p> <p>There are serious concerns about the flooding potential of this development. There is already flooding in the area around the rear of the school, wher old pits have been filled in and the properties on Milestone Lane are all on septic tanks and have issues with high water table. Water flowing from this site would threaten the nearby Wicklewood Mere which is an SSI. The properties along Milestone Lane are not on main sewers and the additional ground water would impact on their septic tanks. We have also recently had confirmation from Anglian Water that the Wicklewood Pumping Station does not have sufficient capacity to get tankers on site quickly enough to prevent overspill into the river if the pumps fail. Although a generator has recently been installed, this only deals with power failure and would not address any mechanical failure.</p> <p>Wicklewood currently has a tax base of just 407 properties. To add another 52 properties is</p>								
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

[illegible]

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
3945	NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (Mr Thomas Clare, ICS Estates Planning Liaison and Policy Lead) [20478]		Policy VC WIC2: Land off Hackford Road	Policy VC WIC2: Land off Hackford Road	The ambulance service, EEASt, are in a unique position that intersects health, transport and community safety and does not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development combined with other developments in the vicinity. This development is likely to increase demand upon existing constrained ambulance services and nationally set blue light response times. The capital required through developer contribution would form a proportion of the required funding for the provision of capacity to absorb the patient growth and demand generated by this development. Any funding would be used towards the capital cost of providing new additional ambulances and/or new additional medical equipment, which for an ambulance service is their physical infrastructure, and/or new additional parking space(s) for ambulances at existing ambulance stations.	None specified. ICS would encourage continued working with LPA.	Not Specified		Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	1861	NHS ICS Response - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/s3g
4147	Environment Agency (Alasdair Hain-Cole, Planning Officer) [20421]		Policy VC WIC2: Land off Hackford Road	Policy VC WIC2: Land off Hackford Road	We recommend both policies VC WIC1REV and VC WIC2 are amended to include a requirement for early engagement with Anglian Water in order to ensure that there is adequate capacity, or capacity can be made available, in the local Water Recycling Centre.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1862	
3996	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19732]		Part 2, Schedule of other major changes	VC BUN2	We welcome the addition of reference to Bunwell Manor Hotel.	None stated.	Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1789	Historic England Representation Letter - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssx Historic England Representation Table - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssj

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4152	Environment Agency (Alasdair Hain-Cole, Planning Officer) [20421]		Part 2, Schedule of other major changes	VC BUN1 and VC BUN2	Current data shows limited capacity at Forngett End WRC. It is not clear why the requirement for early engagement with Anglian Water to determine the capacity of the receiving WRC and the consequent potential need to for phasing is proposed for removal from VC BUN1 and VC BUN2.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1790	

4212	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Adviser) [19732]		Part 2, Schedule of other major changes	Various Policies	<p>Our main remaining concern relates to the archaeology criterion for a number of sites. We recognise that the policy should be proportionate to the site size and heritage sensitivity.</p> <p>However, as currently worded the criterion is not really clear about who needs to be consulted and what assessment needs doing when. The policy also fails to provide for up-front assessment to inform the design and layout of sites to protect any sensitive archaeology.</p> <p>The principal issues relate to both clarity over consultation and also timing of any assessment (desk-based or field-based).</p> <p>As currently drafted, the criterion could be read that an applicant simply has to look at the Historic Environment Record online and decide if they think it needs any further assessment prior to development.</p> <p>Finally, in preparation of the local plan, we encourage you to draw on the knowledge of local conservation officers, the county archaeologist and local heritage groups.</p> <p>Please note that absence of a comment on a policy, allocation or document in this letter does not mean that Historic England is content that the policy, allocation or document is devoid of historic environment issues.</p> <p>We should like to stress that this response is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To</p>	<p>Our main remaining concern relates to the archaeology criterion for a number of sites. We recognise that the policy should be proportionate to the site size and heritage sensitivity.</p> <p>However, as currently worded the criterion is not really clear about who needs to be consulted and what assessment needs doing when. The policy also fails to provide for up-front assessment to inform the design and layout of sites to protect any sensitive archaeology.</p> <p>The principal issues relate to both clarity over consultation and also timing of any assessment (desk-based or field-based).</p> <p>As currently drafted, the criterion could be read that an applicant simply has to look at the Historic Environment Record online and decide if they think it needs any further assessment prior to development.</p> <p>Finally, in preparation of the local plan, we encourage you to draw on the knowledge of local conservation officers, the county archaeologist and local heritage groups.</p> <p>Please note that absence of a comment on a policy, allocation or document in this letter does not mean that Historic England is content that the policy,</p>	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1879	<p>Historic England Representation Letter - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssx</p> <p>Historic England Representation Table - https://southnorfolkandbroadsland.oc2.uk/a/ssj</p>
------	---	--	---	------------------	--	--	---------------	--	--------	-----	----	-----	------	--

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
					<p>avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise as a result of this plan, where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.</p>	<p>allocation or document is devoid of historic environment issues.</p> <p>We should like to stress that this response is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise as a result of this plan, where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.</p>								

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
<u>3980</u>	National Highways (Ms Alice Lawman, Spatial Planner) [20295]		Part 2, Schedule of other major changes, Table at paragraph 1A.10:	Introduction and Background, A.6	<p>National Highways acknowledge that the proposed VCHAP allocates new sites for housing in South Norfolk's villages, which will deliver the bulk of the approximately 1,200 new homes that are to be delivered in this village cluster area by 2038. It has been noted that once adopted, the Local Plan document will become a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Where relevant, National Highways will be a statutory consultee on future planning applications within areas close to the SRN and will assess the impact on the SRN of a planning application accordingly.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above comments, we have reviewed the document and note the details of set out within the draft document and we offer No Comment at this stage.</p>		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1791	

4035	Network Rail Ltd (Mr David Brierley) [20488]		Part 2, Schedule of other major changes, Table at paragraph 1A.10:	VC SPO4	<p>Representations relate to VC SPO4:</p> <p>NR has provided both important general and site-specific comments on the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan – Regulation 19 Pre-submission Addendum.</p> <p>For future development schemes in the South Norfolk area, NR requires that if any new infrastructure requirements affect NR and the operational railway then the appropriate agreements must be entered into by the promoters.</p> <p>NR has a key requirement to manage risk appropriately for all rail infrastructure on safety grounds, to reduce risk so that it is as low as reasonably practicable. NR also requests that any developer and other key stakeholders engage with us early to discuss opportunities and enter into the necessary agreements.</p> <p>Nearby Level Crossing(s), including Spooner Row – Impact Assessment(s) Required and Improvements Requests</p> <p>Developer(s) to provide a transport assessment to show blocking back across level crossings and other effects, including at Spooner Row. NR is happy to discuss with developer before commissioning to ensure right things are covered.</p> <p>It should not be assumed that development sites will not have any impact and thus should not be allocated favourable in policy for any residential or mix-use</p>	<p>Network Rail request the policy be changed and updated to include our railway concerns.</p> <p>Nearby Level Crossing(s), including Spooner Row – Impact Assessment(s) Required and Improvements Requests</p> <p>Developer(s) to provide a transport assessment to show blocking back across level crossings and other effects, including at Spooner Row.</p>	Not Specified		Object	No	No	No	1884	
------	--	--	--	---------	--	---	---------------	--	--------	----	----	----	------	--

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
					<p>allocation with this assumption. Unless it is supported by and of benefit to the railway undertaker or is confirmed to be of no notable detrimental impact to the railway.</p> <p>NR believe the policy is unsound as it is not ‘positively prepared’ because there is no consideration of safety and other concerns. The plan is not ‘justified’ as there is no appropriate strategy or proportionate evidence to determine why these railway factors are discounted in policy.</p> <p>Challenge of ‘soundness’ is even more pertinent as there are considerations in ‘Policies VC-SPO 1 - 4’ on highways and Anglia Water, yet there is no reflection of very similar railway requirements. This proposal does not demonstrate that the “area’s objectively assessed needs” have been met regarding sustainable public transport.</p>									
4150	East Suffolk Council (Mr Dickon Povey, Principal Planner) [19594]		Part 2, Schedule of other major changes, Table at paragraph 1A.10:	Introduction and Background, A.6	Thank you for consulting East Suffolk Council. We have no comments to make.		Not Specified		Support	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1792	

4165	Mrs Patricia Thurgood [20097]		Part 2, Schedule of other major changes, Table at paragraph 1A.10:	VC THU2	<p>I would like to comment on the proposed site VC THU2</p> <p>I object to the proposal for up to 15 residences on this small pocket of uneven land.</p> <p>Visual and heritage impact : The proposal will be an over development of the site. Initially, planning permission was sought for 5 dwellings here, 2 of which have already been completed ; this has now rocketed to 15, which is excessively dense in a village environment.</p> <p>At a South Norfolk planning meeting in 2007 we were told our long front garden was a heritage feature of the old Thurlton, 'a visual amenity' ; this softer edge to the village would be potentially overshadowed if the proposed dense development goes ahead. (The former hedgerow which ran along our boundary with the proposed site was removed without our permission by the site owner ; we subsequently had to erect a fence in its place.)</p> <p>Sewage disposal : the disposal of sewage from below the level of Beccles Road would entail using a pumping station to feed it to the present sewers, bringing with it unwanted noise and smell. Any overflow could potentially pollute the Beck (stream) that runs towards the River Waveney.</p> <p>Sustainability : The lack of safe cycle ways and precarious public transport precludes future residents from travelling to centres of employment unless by car : 15 properties could mean an extra 30 cars exiting (most probably to the right, in</p>		Not Specified		Object	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1878	
------	-------------------------------	--	--	---------	---	--	---------------	--	--------	---------------	---------------	---------------	------	--

[illegible]

[illegible]

Representation ID	Respondent Name and ID	Agent Name and ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Paragraph /Policy	Submission Document Paragraph /Policy	Summary	Proposed Change to Plan	Appearance at examination?	Reason for appearance	Support/ Object	Legally Compliant ?	Sound?	Complies with Duty to Cooperate ?	Council Response ID	Attachments
4185	Anglian Water Services (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [19845]		Part 2, Schedule of other major changes, Table at paragraph 1A.10:	Various Policies as stated in Representation	<p>VC HAD1: Anglian Water would seek to retain the text which refers to the “capacity of the receiving WRC”, because Haddiscoe-Mock Mile Terrace WRC is a ‘descriptive works’ that only serves a small number of properties in the settlement and has limited scope for accommodating additional growth. See commentary on the Water Cycle Study.</p> <p>VC WIN1: Anglian Water would request that the following text is inserted after the proposed clause “and capacity of the receiving WRC”, because Winfarthing Chapel Close WRC is a ‘descriptive works’ that only serves a small number of properties in the settlement (i.e. only Chapel Close) and is constrained in terms of its operating capacity and siting to accommodate further growth. See commentary on the Water Cycle Study.</p> <p>VC WIN2: Given the distance from our small network and WRC in Winfarthing which only serves a small number of properties to the north of the settlement in Chapel Close, it is unlikely that it would be feasible to connect to this site. The requirement for early engagement for Anglian Water is likely to serve no purpose, unless retained to confirm wastewater options with the developer.</p>	<p>VC HAD1: Anglian Water would seek to retain the text which refers to the “capacity of the receiving WRC”</p> <p>VC WIN1: Anglian Water would request that the following text is inserted after the proposed clause “and capacity of the receiving WRC”</p>	Not Specified		Object	Yes	No	Yes	1845	<p>Anglian Water - https://southnorfolkandbroadland.oc2.uk/a/s3v</p>