

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

<b>Cluster</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Council's Comments</b>
Cluster 2: Alpington, Yelverton & Bergh Apton	Change east of Nichols Road, Alpington – part of field, housing opposite.	<p><i>Already included in the Submission VCHAP, but discussion about whether the boundary should be extended.</i></p> <p>Site was originally assessed as SN0529SL. The site was included in the 2021 Regulation 18 consultation and has remained as a proposed settlement limit extension through each stage. The site is a relatively unconstrained corner of a much larger agricultural field. The site is immediately south of a small group of affordable dwellings and on the opposite side of Nichols Road from three established houses</p> <p>There is a current planning application on a slightly larger site, which extends south to the public right of way, which is pending consideration.</p>
Cluster 3: Aslacton, Great Moulton & Tibenham	Implications for settlement boundary south of Church Road	The settlement limit contains the Coppers Close development (the allocated site in the 2015 Local Plan), however the Council considers that there would be merit in including Boundary Villa (on the corner of Church Road and Woodrow Lane) in the settlement limit.
Cluster 3: Aslacton, Great Moulton & Tibenham	Small change on Pottergate Street	<p><i>Already included in the Submission VCHAP</i></p> <p>This change reflects a site with detailed permission for two dwellings in the curtilage of an existing house (2018/1384).</p>
Cluster 3: Aslacton, Great Moulton & Tibenham	Small change at Sneath Common	<p><i>Already included in the Submission VCHAP</i></p> <p>This change reflects a completed dwelling, permitted under a previous lack of 5 Year Housing Land Supply.</p>

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

Cluster	Location	Council's Comments
Cluster 3: Aslacton, Great Moulton & Tibenham	Land at Sneath Common  (Alternative raised in discussion with the Parish Council)	Site SN2118 (south of Sneath Road, east of Plantation Road) was also discussed; this was submitted for consideration in the VCHAP and was assessed as a reasonable alternative but was not included as a preferred site due to 0.1% surface water flood risk that covers much of the site. However, the eastern quarter of the site appears to be outside of the surface water flood risk area and may be suitable for 3-4 dwellings as part of the settlement limit extension.
Cluster 4: Barford, Marlingford, Colton & Wrampingham	Should Wrampingham have settlement limits?	The Council does not consider Wrampingham to be appropriate for a settlement limit.  Wrampingham relies on the services and facilities in Barford, the ability to walk between the settlements is limited and there is no bus service. The Street is characterised by dwellings in spacious plots, and a settlement limit could encourage inappropriate development. The main built part of the village, around The Street, Hall Lane and Wymondham Road is within a Conservation Area.
Cluster 4: Barford, Marlingford, Colton & Wrampingham	Should the settlement limits at Colton be extended to the south?	Whilst Colton has limited facilities, it does have a village hall, a pub and very limited bus to Longwater retail park, plus good access to local employment opportunities.  A settlement limit extension to the south could incorporate properties on The Street/Marlingford Road, although the opportunities for infill would be limited.
Cluster 5: Barnham Broom, Kimberley, Carleton Forehoe, Runhall & Brandon Parva	Should Welbourne have settlement limits?	The Council does not consider Welbourne to be appropriate for a settlement limit.  Welbourne is very limited in terms of services and facilities (with only a small village hall) and is reliant on nearby Mattishall (outside of South Norfolk District). Roads within the settlement are narrow, with no footways. There is no bus service within the village. Development is quite dispersed and rural in character, and a settlement limit would be likely to encourage inappropriate infill development.

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

Cluster	Location	Council's Comments
Cluster 5: Barnham Broom, Kimberley, Carleton Forehoe, Runhall & Brandon Parva	Settlement Limit change south of Norwich Road, Barnham Broom  Part of field, undeveloped opposite? Encroachment into green gap between parts of village	<p><i>Already included in the Submission VCHAP</i></p> <p>The proposed extension is the road frontage element of a larger field, development in depth of the wider field would encroach more on the adjacent non-designated heritage asset (Manor Farm), especially when considered in combination with VC BB1.</p> <p>Encroachment into the gap was considered as part of the site assessment process. Any application would need to be considered in the context of the adjoining development, with relatively spacious plots, and the substantial grounds of Manor Farm would remain undeveloped. The substantial green frontage opposite would be unaffected.</p>

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

<b>Cluster</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Council's Comments</b>
<p>Cluster 5: Barnham Broom, Kimberley, Carleton Forehoe, Runhall &amp; Brandon Parva</p>	<p>Settlement Limit change north of Norwich Road, Barnham Broom</p> <p>Part of field, undeveloped opposite? Further elongation of village?</p>	<p><i>Already included in the Submission VCHAP</i></p> <p>Site (originally assessed as SN0018SL) reflects the extent of a previous planning application for two dwellings, which was refused when the site was outside of the Settlement Limit.</p> <p>In the 2003 Local Plan the whole paddock was in the Settlement Limit, but was removed in the 2015 Plan on the basis that no applications had been made to bring the site forward between its promotion in the late 1990s and consideration for the 2015 Local Plan.</p> <p>Site opposite is undeveloped but was considered by the Council to be a reasonable alternative site and included in the Regulation 18 Focussed Changes document.</p> <p>Whilst the site would elongate development on the north side of the road, it is connected to services and facilities by footway and is considered acceptable, taking into account the telephone exchange building to the NE of the site and the development at Pockthorpe Loke (on the opposite side of Norwich Road).</p> <p>Overall, the Council would consider reinstating the Settlement Limit around the whole of the paddock, if this was considered to facilitate a better form of development.</p>
<p>Cluster 6: Bawburgh</p>	<p>Change east of Stocks Hill, north of allocation BAW1REV</p>	<p><i>Already included in the Submission VCHAP</i></p> <p>Individual backland plot which was promoted for a single dwelling. Normally might be resisted, but in the context of VC BAW1REV, it was considered appropriate</p>

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

Cluster	Location	Council's Comments
Cluster 7: Bressingham	Should Fersfield have settlement limits?	Fersfield does not have any contiguous form of development and no footpaths back to Bressingham. There are properties along the The Street, but it is not a settlement that the Council recognises as meriting a settlement limit.
Cluster 8: Brooke, Kirstead & Howe	Change east of High Green and north of The Mallows Walk	<p><i>Already included in the Submission VCHAP</i></p> <p>The site was originally assessed as SN0020SL and was consider appropriate for a settlement limit extension, in the context of the new development at The Mallows Walk.</p> <p>The site is subject to a proposed modification to the supporting text, in response to concerns raised by Historic England. Any constraints could be suitably dealt with through a planning application.</p>
Cluster 9: Bunwell	Should Bunwell Hill have settlement limits?	<p>The Council does not consider Bunwell Hill to be appropriate for a settlement limit.</p> <p>Bunwell Hill is detached from the main areas of the settlement and currently has a pleasant rural setting in part a result of the existing vegetation around the current development. Potential loss of this through infill development may adversely impact on the overall character of Bunwell Hill.</p>
Cluster 10: Burston, Shimpling & Gissing	Should Gissing have settlement limits?	<p>The Council does not consider Gissing to be appropriate for a settlement limit.</p> <p>Gissing is 2 miles north of Burston. Its core is centred around Common Road, New Road, and Lower Street near the Crown Inn. Footpath provision is very limited and the sporadic form development, with large properties in spacious plots, does not lend itself easily to establishing a settlement limit.</p>

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

Cluster	Location	Council's Comments
Cluster 13: Ditchingham, Broome, Hedenham & Thwaite	Change northwest of Lambert's Way. Planning permission now for 4 dwellings.	<p><i>Already included in the Submission VCHAP</i></p> <p>The Council included this change after it was originally assessed as SN2011SL and considered to be appropriate for a settlement limit extension.</p> <p>As referred to, the site now has planning permission for 4 dwellings, albeit on a slightly larger footprint than the proposed settlement limit extension.</p>
Cluster 13: Ditchingham, Broome, Hedenham & Thwaite	Should Waterside Drive and Falcon Lane be included in the settlement limits?	Both areas are within the Broads Authority area and are covered by the Broads Local Plan.
Cluster 15: Forncett St Mary & Forncett St Peter	Should the area on Mill Road be included?	This hamlet of dwellings is located west of Forncett St Peter. Mill Road is narrow with no footways. The dwellings themselves are mostly semi-detached with long back gardens and are surrounded by open fields with wide views. The potential for infill development is likely to be limited.
Cluster 15: Forncett St Mary & Forncett St Peter	Should Hunts Mead be included?	<p>Hunts Mead is located north east of Forncett St Peter and is a relatively new development of larger homes, built on the site of a former fuel depot.</p> <p>The area is some distance away from the main built areas of Forncett St Peter and Forncett St Mary, which are accessed by Station Road and Low Road, both of which are narrow rural roads with no footways. There are few gaps in the built form that would appear to be suitable for infill, and the Council would not wish to encourage extensions to this group of dwellings (e.g. under GNLP Policy 7.5) through the creation of a Settlement Limit.</p>
Cluster 16: Gillingham, Geldeston & Stockton	Should the area west of Gillingham on King's Dam have settlement limits?	King's Dam marks the boundary of the Broads Authority Area, therefore only development on the north side would be covered by the VCHAP. There are also areas of Zone 2 and 3 flood risk along the road frontage. Given the sensitivities of the area, the Council would not necessarily want to encourage intensification in this location.

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

<b>Cluster</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Council's Comments</b>
Cluster 16: Gillingham, Geldeston & Stockton	Should West End, Geldeston have settlement limits?	<p>The Council does not consider West End to be appropriate for a settlement limit.</p> <p>Whilst in form and character there would be some infill potential, further development appears to be constrained by the narrow, unadopted nature of the road, and the access onto Old Yarmouth Road. There are also no obvious direct pedestrian/cycle link with the remainder of the village.</p>
Cluster 17: Hales & Heckingham, Langley with Hardley, Carleton St Peter, Claxton, Raveningham & Sisland	Should Langley Street/area East of Hardley Road be included?	<p>Langley Street and Hardley Road mark the Councils boundary with the Broads Authority area. The dwellings north/east of Langley Street and Hardley Road are within the Broads Authority Area and are covered by the Broads Local Plan.</p>
Cluster 18: Hempnall, Topcroft Street, Morningthorpe, Fritton, Shelton & Hardwick	Should Fritton have settlement limits?	<p>The Council does not consider Fritton is suitable for a Settlement Limit.</p> <p>The village is characterised by rural development around the large common, which is reflected in the extensive Conservation Area that extends from St Catherine's Church in the north to Blacksmiths Lane in the south.</p> <p>However, the Council considers there is potential for an additional settlement limit within this cluster at Alburgh Road, Hempnall Green. Although services here are limited to a pub, there is a Monday-Saturday bus service, 6-7 times a day, between the GNLP 'Main Towns' of Harleston and Long Stratton, and Norwich, and the form character of the area would</p>
Cluster 20: Keswick & Intwood	Should Keswick have a settlement limit?	<p>Keswick has a settlement limit, taken from the 2015 Local Plan, however the Policies Map was not included in the submission version of the VCHAP in error.</p> <p>The Council proposes that this can be corrected by a Main Modification.</p>

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

<b>Cluster</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Council's Comments</b>
Cluster 21: Ketteringham	Should Ketteringham have a settlement limit?	<p>Ketteringham is a very small settlement with limited existing development separated into two clear groupings, along High Street and around Ketteringham Hall. There are very limited facilities and services with a village hall and preschool. The closest schools are in Hethersett (the catchment schools) and Wymondham.</p> <p>On the gap between the two areas of settlement limit, there is a listed war memorial on the road frontage, opposite the village hall. The Council has previously resisted allocations and planning applications in this location.</p> <p>There is potential for an additional stretch of settlement limit to the east of the war memorial as far as 1 High Street, reflecting a previous planning permission.</p>
Cluster 22: Kirby Cane & Ellingham	Should the area of housing to west on Yarmouth Road be included?	<p>This area constitutes the built part of Ellingham along Old Yarmouth Road. There are no services within the area and residents would need to use the A143 (albeit briefly) as there is no direct link between the two areas; however, there is a pedestrian/cycle crossing point. There are also some limited bus services to nearby market towns.</p> <p>Therefore, there appears to be some potential for a new area of Settlement Limit, facilitating limited infill development.</p>
Cluster 22: Kirby Cane & Ellingham	Should area of housing to north on School Road be included?	<p>The Council does not consider this area to be suitable for a settlement limit.</p> <p>This area is very isolated from the rest of built areas of the cluster and is connected by narrow, rural roads with no footways. Existing dwellings include terraces and detached dwellings with very few gaps, therefore the potential for infill appears to be limited.</p>

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

<b>Cluster</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Council's Comments</b>
Cluster 23: Little Melton & Great Melton	Changes reflect existing development?	<p><i>Already included in the Submission VCHAP</i></p> <p>Three of the Settlement Limit changes reflect development permitted and completed since the 2015 Local Plan (Gibbs Close, Sinclair Close &amp; School Lane). The fourth change, the triangle of land north of Great Melton Road, was proposed by the owner of one of the dwellings fronting the road to which the land is connected and assessed (as site SN1046REV) to be appropriate for a settlement limit extension.</p>
Cluster 23: Little Melton & Great Melton	Should small area on School Lane be included?	The Council considers that the area at the eastern end of School Lane (adjacent to the A47) could be included as a small area of additional settlement limit.
Cluster 24: Morley & Deopham	Should Deopham have a settlement limit?	<p>The Council does not consider that Deopham is suitable for a settlement limit.</p> <p>Deopham is made up of scattered groups of housing and has no clear central area of built development which could be suitably defined by a settlement limit.</p>
Cluster 25: Mulbarton, Bracon Ash, Swardeston & East Carleton	Should East Carleton have settlement limits?	<p>The Council does not consider that East Carleton is appropriate for a settlement limit.</p> <p>East Carleton is characterised by dispersed development. The introduction of the settlement limit could result in inappropriate scales of development in this rural location. There are no services or facilities within East Carleton (other than a handful of small-scale businesses) and no pedestrian routes between East Carleton and Mulbarton or Swardeston, and no options to create safe connectivity on roads which are at the national speed limit. East Carleton is served by one bus a day to/from Mulbarton and Wymondham.</p>

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

<b>Cluster</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Council's Comments</b>
Cluster 26: Needham, Brockdish, Starston & Wortwell	Change north of UR Church and west of High Road, Wortwell – consolidation of ribbon development?	<p><i>Already included in the Submission VCHAP</i></p> <p>Site adjacent to the chapel was assessed as SN5045SL, with heritage and landscape issues identified. It is considered that these constraints can be addressed through an appropriate planning application. An outline application for 4 dwellings was submitted in November and is currently under consideration.</p> <p>Inclusion of SN5045SL in the settlement limit facilitated the inclusion of the small group of dwellings immediately to the north for consistency.</p>
Cluster 26: Needham, Brockdish, Starston & Wortwell	Small change at south end of High Road	<p><i>Already included in the Submission VCHAP</i></p> <p>Reflects completed dwellings previously permitted due to a lack of 5-Year Land Supply.</p>
Cluster 26: Needham, Brockdish, Starston & Wortwell	Small change at Brockdish	<p><i>Already included in the Submission VCHAP</i></p> <p>Reflects a completed dwelling, previously permitted due to a lack of 5-Year Land Supply.</p>
Cluster 26: Needham, Brockdish, Starston & Wortwell	Should Thorpe Abbots have settlement limits?	<p>The Council does not consider that Thorpe Abbots is appropriate for a settlement limit.</p> <p>Thorpe Abbots is considered to have a distinctive Conservation Area, centred around The Street and Mill Road, which retains strong characteristics of a Victorian estate village. This is enhanced by the presence of mature trees and hedgerows. Whilst the village has a small village hall and is on a bus route between the GNLP 'Main Towns' of Harleston and Diss, it is detached from other local services and facilities, and separated from Brockdish by the A143.</p>

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

<b>Cluster</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Council's Comments</b>
Cluster 29: Rockland St Mary, Hellington & Holverston	Should detached area to east be included?	<p>The Council does not consider this area to be suitable for a settlement limit.</p> <p>Including the area around Green Lane would significantly elongate the village to the east and bring it closer to the Broads Authority Area. This would lead to the potential for inappropriate infill development or development at a scale that would not be suitable.</p>
Cluster 33: Seething and Mundham	Change west of Seething Road - opposite development. Scope for infill?	<p><i>Already included in the Submission VCHAP</i></p> <p>The change to the settlement limit to the west of Seething Road has been drawn to include two new dwellings and areas with planning applications that are currently pending consideration, these were assessed as SN0588SL, SN0406SL and SN0587SL.</p>
Cluster 33: Seething and Mundham	New settlement limit west of Mill Lane, Seething - Why the only addition?	<p><i>Already included in the Submission VCHAP</i></p> <p>The new part of the settlement limit has been drawn to include the existing linear development on Mill Lane, to the south of the proposed allocation VC SEE1 and to the north of the settlement. Mill Lane is clearly a substantial and more recent development than the rest of Seething, justifying its inclusion, but also justifying the need for a gap along Brooke Road.</p>
Cluster 33: Seething and Mundham	Should Seething Old Hall Park be included?	<p>The Council does not consider this area to be suitable for a settlement limit.</p> <p>The development at Old Hall Park is characterised by relatively large dwellings surrounded by dense vegetation. The area is also south of the Grade II Listed Old Hall. Including this area within a settlement limit has the potential to encourage inappropriate development that could detrimentally affect the existing character and the setting of Old Hall.</p>
Cluster 34: Spooner Row and Suton	Should The Ridings be included?	<p>The Council would support a modification to include The Ridings within the Settlement Limit.</p>

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

Cluster	Location	Council's Comments
Cluster 34: Spooner Row and Sutton	Should Sutton have settlement limits?	<p>The Council does not consider that Sutton is appropriate for a settlement limit.</p> <p>The main locations for a Settlement Limit would be the employment sites at London Road/Station Road and the mixed employment and residential development along the Sutton Street/Eleven Mile Lane. Allocations and Settlement Limits for employment sites were considered through the GNLP process, and currently there is no defined limit for Sutton. The residential development on Sutton Street/Eleven Mile Lane is characterised by notably large plots in quite a dispersed pattern; as such it would be difficult to create a coherent Settlement Limit which did not allow significant scope for infill development.</p>
Cluster 35: Stoke Holy Cross, Shotesham and Caistor St Edmund & Bixley	Should Arminghall have settlement limits?	<p>Arminghall (around Arminghall Lane) is some distance away from the other villages in the cluster, however it is well related to Poringland/ Framingham Earl, with good bus, cycle and footway links to Poringland and other locations</p> <p>The existing development is made up of various housing types with some clear gaps in the building frontage. The Council considers there is potential for a small area on new Settlement Limit at Arminghall Lane.</p>
Cluster 35: Stoke Holy Cross, Shotesham and Caistor St Edmund & Bixley	Should Shotesham have settlement limits?	<p>Shotesham has a settlement limit that has been tightly drawn to reflect the Conservation Area that covers the village.</p>

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

<b>Cluster</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Council's Comments</b>
Cluster 39: Tharston, Hapton and Flordon	Should Tharston have a settlement limit?	<p>The Council does not consider that the parts of Tharston covered by the VCHAP are appropriate for a settlement limit.</p> <p>Tharston is characterised by detached dwellings in plots of significant sizes and mature vegetation and landscaping, interspersed with historic farm buildings and farmsteads, including a significant cluster of listed buildings in the centre of the village around the T-junction. Existing development is within two separate groupings. A detached area to the north-west of Long Stratton and a separate area that is contiguous with Long Stratton. Although the parish lies within the village clusters, the latter part of the parish closest to Long Stratton was considered by the GNLP as part of the Main Towns allocations.</p>
Cluster 39: Tharston, Hapton and Flordon	Should Hapton have a settlement limit?	<p>Hapton is a small, linear settlement. Hapton was considered for a new settlement limit extension at the Reg-18 stage, alongside a potential allocation site north of The Street (up to 12 dwellings).</p> <p>The allocation site was discounted following a review of all sites between the initial Reg-18 and Reg-19 stages. It was considered that it was not supporting services and facilities within the cluster, rather it has a closer relationship with Long Stratton, which already has strategic-scale housing allocations.</p> <p>Without the allocation it was decided not to define a settlement limit for Hapton; however, the Council would consider a new settlement limit for the village, to facilitate limited infill development.</p>

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

<b>Cluster</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Council's Comments</b>
Cluster 40: Thurlton and Norton Subcourse	Should Lower Thurlton have settlement limits?	<p>The Council does not consider that Lower Thurlton is appropriate for a settlement limit.</p> <p>Lower Thurlton is detached from local services and facilities with no public transport. The area is immediately adjoining Broads Authority area and is characterised by large plots, agricultural buildings, and a narrow access road with established hedgerows and trees. Establishing a settlement limit could end up with significant levels of development coming forward as infill and detrimentally impacting the local character.</p>
Cluster 41: Thurton and Ashby St Mary	Should White Heath Road be included?	<p>The Council considers that there is potential for a small area of settlement limit between junctions with The Street and Lion Lane.</p>
Cluster 42: Tivetshall St Mary and Tivetshall St Margaret	Should Tivetshall St Mary have settlement limits?	<p>The Council considers that there is potential for a settlement limit around dwellings on Rectory Lane.</p> <p>These were previously excluded when using shorter distance to services criteria in the 2015 Local Plan, but would now be consistent with the distance to services criteria used for the VCHAP.</p>
Cluster 43: Toft Monks, Aldeby, Haddiscoe, Wheatacre and Burgh St Peter	Change west of Mill Road, Burgh St Peter	<p>This change is a small extension (originally assessed as SN4015 for approximately 1 – 2 dwellings), mirroring development on the opposite side of Mill Road.</p>
Cluster 43: Toft Monks, Aldeby, Haddiscoe, Wheatacre and Burgh St Peter	Should Wheatacre have settlement limits?	<p>The Council does not consider that Wheatacre is appropriate for a settlement limit.</p> <p>The areas of Wheatacre not covered by the Burgh St Peter Settlement Limit, are generally very rural in nature, with limited services/facilities and a lack of a defined core to the village. They generally rely on narrow rural roads, with no footways and would likely to lead to pressure for inappropriate infill development.</p>

Examination of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)  
 South Norfolk Council Responses to the Inspector's Settlement Limit Queries

Cluster	Location	Council's Comments
Cluster 44: Wacton	Should Wacton have settlement limits?	<p>Wacton had a Settlement Limit in the 2001 Local Plan, and was the only South Norfolk settlement to lose its Settlement Limit under the Joint Core Strategy, due to the lack of local facilities.</p> <p>Whilst there is a village hall with outdoor space, Wacton relies on services and facilities (including the Primary School) in the nearby GNLP 'Main Town' of Long Stratton.</p> <p>However, the 2001 Limit could be reinstated, with any necessary modifications to reflect more recent development, to allow for some small-scale infilling.</p>
Cluster 48: Wreningham, Ashwellthorpe and Fundenhall	Should Fundenhall have settlement limits?	<p>The Council does not consider that Fundenhall is appropriate for a settlement limit.</p> <p>This is a very dispersed settlement with no key central area. The most developed section lies to the east of the B1113 (The Turnpike) but is contained by a field boundary immediately to the north and Fundenhall Road immediately to the south. As such, there is no clear area around which to draw the boundaries.</p>

South Norfolk Council  
 6 February 2026