

Plans Team, The Planning Inspectorate

Via email

plans.admin@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

4 August 2025

Dear Planning Inspectorate

Submission of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)

I write to confirm that South Norfolk Council are submitting their Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP) in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) and Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended).

The VCHAP sets out housing allocations for villages in South Norfolk to deliver the minimum requirement of 1,200 homes set out in the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP), which was adopted in March 2024.

The core documents are listed in Appendix A to this letter and are being transferred to you by MailBigFile.

The supporting evidence documents listed in Appendix B to this letter will be available online as part of the examination library at <https://www.southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk/planning/future-development/local-plans/emerging-local-plan/south-norfolk-village-clusters-housing-allocations-plan-examination>

Attached at Appendix C is a schedule of not duly made representations. These do not raise any new issues but are presented for completeness.

In accordance with Section 20 (7C) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended), the Council formally requests that the appointed Inspector recommends such modifications to the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan as may be necessary to ensure legal compliance and soundness.

The Council have appointed Mrs. Annette Feeney to be the independent Programme Officer for the examination. Her contact details are:

Annette.feeney@southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk and her telephone number is 07775 771026.

On the basis that the Local Plan contains only non-strategic site allocation policies, and given the matters within the plan to be considered, the Council estimates the hearing sessions element of the examination process may need to last up to two weeks. The Council would suggest a preferred timescale for holding the hearings in

the second and third weeks of November 2025. We anticipate approximately 120 people wishing to participate.

Yours sincerely

Adam Banham

Place Shaping Manager

Adam.banham@southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk

Appendix A – List of core submission documents

Reference	Document	Date	Author
A.1.1	Regulation 19 Pre-submission Draft including Addendum South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan July 2024	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.1	Settlement Limits in South Norfolk	June 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.2.2	North East Settlement Limits in South Norfolk	June 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.2.3	North West Settlement Limits in South Norfolk	June 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.2.4	South East Settlement Limits in South Norfolk	June 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.2.5	South West Settlement Limits in South Norfolk	June 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.2.6	Alburgh - Map 79	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.7	Denton - Map 80	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.8	Alpington and Yelverton - Map 53	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.9	Bergh Apton - Map 54	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.10	Aslacton - Map 27	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.11	Great Moulton and Aslacton - Map 28	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.12	Great Moulton - Map 29	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.13	Tibenham - Map 26	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.14	Barford - Map 4	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.15	Marlingford - Map 2	July 2024	South Norfolk Council

Reference	Document	Date	Author
A.2.16	Colton - Map 3	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.17	Barnham Broom - Map 1	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.18	Bawburgh - Map 5	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.19	Bressingham - Map 32	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.20	Brooke 1 - Map 51	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.21	Brooke 2 - Map 52	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.22	Bunwell 1 - Map 20	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.23	Bunwell 2 - Map 21	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.24	Burston and Shimpling - Map 34	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.25	Carleton Rode - Map 19	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.26	Dickleburgh and Rushall - Map 36	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.27	Ditchingham - Map 65	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.28	Broome - Map 66	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.29	Hedenham - Map 64	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.30	Earsham - Map 81	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.31	Forngett St Mary - Map 24	July 2024	South Norfolk Council

Reference	Document	Date	Author
A.2.32	Forngett St Peter - Map 25	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.33	Gillingham - Map 69	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.34	Geldeston - Map 68	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.35	Hales and Heckingham - Map 58	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.36	Langley with Hardley 1 - Map 45	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.37	Langley with Hardley 2 - Map 46	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.38	Claxton - Map 44	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.39	Hempnall - Map 61	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.40	Topcroft - Map 62	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.41	Shelton and Hardwick - Map 60	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.42	Ketteringham - Map 8	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.43	Kirby Cane and Ellingham - Map 67	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.44	Little Melton - Map 6	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.45	Morley 1 - Map 11	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.46	Morley 2 - Map 12	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.47	Mulbarton - Map 17	July 2024	South Norfolk Council

Reference	Document	Date	Author
A.2.48	Mulbarton and Bracon Ash - Map 16	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.49	Swardeston 1 - Map 9	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.50	Swardeston 2 - Map 10	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.51	Needham - Map 76	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.52	Brockdish - Map 38	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.53	Starston - Map 77	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.54	Wortwell - Map 78	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.55	Newton Flotman - Map 48	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.56	Swainsthorpe - Map 39	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.57	Pulham Market - Map 74	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.58	Pulham St Mary - Map 75	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.59	Rockland St Mary - Map 43	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.60	Roydon - Map 33	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.61	Saxlingham Nethergate - Map 49	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.62	Scole - Map 37	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.63	Seething 1 - Map 56	July 2024	South Norfolk Council

Reference	Document	Date	Author
A.2.64	Seething 2 - Map 57	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.65	Spooner Row - Map 13	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.66	Stoke Holy Cross - Map 40	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.67	Shotesham - Map 50	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.68	Surlingham - Map 42	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.69	Bramerton - Map 41	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.70	Tacolneston - Map 22	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.71	Forncett End - Map 23	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.72	Tasburgh - Map 59	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.73	Flordon - Map 18	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.74	Thurlton and Norton Subcourse - Map 47	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.75	Thurton and Ashby St Mary - Map 55	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.76	Tivetsall Mt Margaret and Tivetsall St Mary - Map 35	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.77	Toft Monks - Map 70	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.78	Aldeby - Map 72	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.79	Haddiscoe - Map 71	July 2024	South Norfolk Council

Reference	Document	Date	Author
A.2.80	Burgh St Peter - Map 73	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.81	Wicklewood - Map 7	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.82	Winfarthing - Map 30	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.83	Shelfanger - Map 31	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.84	Woodton - Map 63	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.85	Wreningham - Map 15	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.2.86	Ashwellthorpe and Fundenhall - Map 14	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.3.1	Sustainability Appraisal	June 2024	Aecom
A.4.1	Habitats Regulations Assessment	June 2024	Lepus Consulting
A.5.1	Statement of Consultation - Introduction	April 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.5.2	Statement of Consultation - Part 1 GNLP Consultations (Reg 18)	March 2023	South Norfolk Council
A.5.3	Statement of Consultation - Part 2 South Norfolk Council Consultations (Reg 18)	March 2023	South Norfolk Council
A.5.4	Statement of Consultation - Part 3 Publication (Reg 19)	December 2023	South Norfolk Council
A.5.5	Statement of Consultation - Part 4 Alternative Sites and Focused Changes Consultation (Reg 18)	April 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.5.6	Statement of Consultation - Part 5 Regulation 19 Pre-submission Addendum	April 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.6.1	Duty to Cooperate Statement	July 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.6.2	List of Additional Modifications and Potential Main Modifications Arising from the Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) and the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment NaFRA2 Addendum (May 2025)	July 2025	South Norfolk Council

Reference	Document	Date	Author
A.7.1	Equality Impact Assessment	April 2024	South Norfolk Council
A.8.1	Regulation 19 Representations on the VCHAP in document order	July 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.8.2	Regulation 19 Representations on the VCHAP in respondent order	July 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.8.3	Regulation 19 Addendum Representations on the VCHAP in document order	July 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.8.4	Regulation 19 Addendum Representations on the VCHAP in respondent order	July 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.9.1	Submission Letter	July 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.9.2	Submission Notice	July 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.10.1	Local Development Scheme	January 2025	South Norfolk Council
A.11.1	Statement of Community Involvement	February 2025	South Norfolk Council

Appendix B - List of supporting evidence documents for submission

Reference	Document	Date	Author
B.1.1	Alburgh and Denton Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.2	Alpington, Yelverton and Bergh Apton Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.3	Aslacton, Great Moulton and Tibenham Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.4	Barford, Marlingford, Colton, and Wramplingham Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.5	Barnham Broom, Kimberley, Carlton Forhoe, Runhall and Brandon Parva Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.6	Bawburgh Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.7	Bressingham Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.8	Brooke, Kirstead and Howe Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.9	Bunwell Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.10	Burston, Shimpling and Gissing Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.11	Carleton Rode Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.12	Dickleburgh and Rushall Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.13	Ditchingham, Broome, Hedenham and Thwaite Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.14	Earsham Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.15	Fornsett St Mary and Fornsett St Peter Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.16	Gillingham, Geldeston and Stockton Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council

Reference	Document	Date	Author
B.1.17	Hales, Heckingham, Langley with Hardley, Carlton St Peter, Claxton, Raveningham and Sisland Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.18	Hempnall, Topcroft St, Morningthorpe, Fritton, Shelton and Hardwick Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.19	Keswick and Intwood Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.20	Ketteringham Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.21	Kirby Cane and Ellingham Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.22	Little Melton and Great Melton Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.23	Morley and Deopham Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.24	Mulbarton, Bracon Ash, Swardeston and East Carleton Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.25	Needham, Brockdish, Starston and Wortwell Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.26	Newton Flotman and Swainsthorpe Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.27	Pulham Market and Pulham St Mary Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.28	Rockland St Mary, Hellington and Holverston Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.29	Roydon Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.30	Saxlingham Nethergate Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.31	Scole Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.32	Seething and Mundham Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council

Reference	Document	Date	Author
B.1.33	Spooner Row and Sutton Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.34	Stoke Holy Cross, Shoteshame, Caistor St Edmund and Bixley Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.35	Surlingham, Bramerton and Kirby Bedon Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.36	Tacolneston and Forncett End Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.37	Tasburgh Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.38	Tharston, Hapton and Flordon Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.39	Thurlton and Norton Subcourse Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.40	Thurton and Ashby St Mary Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.41	Tivetshall St Mary and Tivetshall St Margaret Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.42	Toft Monks, Aldeby, Haddiscoe, Wheatacre and Burgh St Peter Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.43	Wacton Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.44	Wicklewood Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.45	Winfarthing and Shelfanger Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.46	Woodton and Bedingham Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.47	Wreningham, Ashwellthorpe and Fundenhall Site Assessments	Compiled July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.1.48	South Norfolk Village Clusters Site Assessment Updated Criteria for Part 3 and Part 6	2020	South Norfolk Council

Reference	Document	Date	Author
B.2.1	Carried Forward Site Allocations Review	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
B.3.1	Health Impact Assessment	April 2024	South Norfolk Council
B.4.1	Heritage Impact Assessments	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
B.4.2	Heritage Impact Assessments Map Key	July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.5.1	Landscape Visual Assessments	July 2024	South Norfolk Council
B.6.1	Viability Appraisal	June 2024	Norse Consulting
B.7.1	Water Cycle Study	July 2024	Aecom
B.8.1	SFRA Level 1 Report	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.2	SFRA Level 1 Appendix A GeoPDF User Guide	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.3	SFRA Level 1 Appendix B Data Sources	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.4	SFRA Level 1 Appendix C SFRA User Guide	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.5	SFRA Level 1 Appendix D Flood Warnings	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.6	SFRA Level 1 Appendix E Summary of Flood Risk	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.7	SFRA Level 1 Appendix F CIA	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.8	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF A4	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.9	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF B2	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.10	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF B3	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.11	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF B4	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.12	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF B6	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.13	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF B7	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.14	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF C1	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.15	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF C2	June 2024	JBA Consulting

Reference	Document	Date	Author
B.8.16	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF C3	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.17	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF C4	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.18	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF C5	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.19	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF C6	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.20	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF C7	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.21	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF C8	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.22	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF C9	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.23	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF C10	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.24	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF D1	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.25	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF D2	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.26	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF D3	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.27	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF D4	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.28	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF D5	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.29	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF D6	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.30	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF D7	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.31	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF D8	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.32	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF D9	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.33	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF D10	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.34	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF E2	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.35	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF E3	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.36	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF E10	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.8.37	SFRA Level 1 GeoPDF E11	June 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.1	SFRA Level 2 Report	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.2	SFRA Level 2 Appendix A1 Site Summary Tables	July 2024	JBA Consulting

Reference	Document	Date	Author
B.9.3	SFRA Level 2 Appendix A2 Site Summary Tables	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.4	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF SN0262	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.5	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF SN0274REVA	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.6	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF SN0274REVB	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.7	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF SN0488REV	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.8	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF SN1015REV	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.9	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF SN2036REV	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.10	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF SN2118	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.11	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF SN2183REV	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.12	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF VCALP1	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.13	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF VCASH1	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.14	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF VCBAR1	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.15	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF VCBB1	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.16	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF VCBRO1	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.17	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF VCDIT1	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.18	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF VCGIL1 and VCGIL1REV	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.19	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF VCHAL1	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.20	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF VCPSP1	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.21	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF VCSP02	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.22	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF VCWIC1REV	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.23	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF VCWIN2	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.24	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF VCWOR1	July 2024	JBA Consulting
B.9.25	SFRA Level 2 NaFRA2 Addendum	July 2025	JBA Consulting
B.9.26	SFRA Level 2 Site Table VC EAR2	July 2025	JBA Consulting

Reference	Document	Date	Author
B.9.27	SFRA Level 2 GeoPDF VC EAR2	July 2025	JBA Consulting
B.10.1	Delivery Statements	June 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.11.1	Topic Paper	July 2025	South Norfolk Council
B.12.1	Greater Norwich Local Plan Document Library		

Appendix C – Schedule of not duly made representations

Regulation 19 Publication 2023

Name/ Organisation	Regulation 19 Section/ Policy/ Paragraph	Submission Document Section/ Policy/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Council Response
Tacolneston Parish Council (Dan Wickham)	VC TAC1	VC TAC1	<p>Felt proper consultation did not take place. Process feels very rushed perhaps due to elections. Confusion over apparent inconsistencies in Settlement Limit around 2015 Local Plan site SN0602. Confusion over use of different codes for maps between June 2021 and December 2022.</p> <p>Already expecting 21 homes on SN0602 which is struggling with Nutrient Neutrality requirements. Appears Nutrient Neutrality has not been assessed for any sites.</p> <p>No reference at exhibition to schools in Tacolneston and Forncett. Could it be explained why as catchments have been used to define clusters. School currently at capacity (105). Do note the requirement for housing to be located close to the school as noted by district and county councillors.</p> <p>Consider choice of SN1057 as unsound due to red impact on landscape which could not be mitigated as gap between two distinct parts of the settlement would be eroded. Petition of over 300 presented to Council.</p> <p>Site is inaccurately described as 'flat' despite the site being called 'Hill Top Farm'. Also concerned over access as site assessment states adequate access would require removal of vegetation and trees along frontage. Trees also subject to TPOs.</p>	<p>Please see Council response ID: 1160 responding to Tacolneston Parish Councils concerns over the preparation of maps and plans and the labelling of the primary schools.</p> <p>The impact on the landscape is addressed in paragraph 37.9 of the VCHAP. It is stated that with appropriate design and landscaping, as well as within the context of the existing developments, the site will not have a significant impact on the wider landscape setting.</p>

Bracon Ash Residents Group (Alfred Barnes)	Paragraph 25.24 VC BRA1	Paragraph 25.28 VC BRA1	<p>Comments relate to Paragraph 25.24 and Policy VC BRA1</p> <p>Consider allocation of VC BRA1 to be unsound as evidence is out of date and no longer relevant.</p> <p>Regulation 10A of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 states that Local Plan reviews are required at least every 5 years. 23 houses have been built since 2015 Local Plan to satisfy the housing requirement, therefore BRA1 is no longer needed. New houses are significantly larger than those planned. Significant housing growth in adjacent Mulbarton also considered. Housing need assessment is therefore out of date.</p> <p>Sustainability assessment out of date as Mulbarton population has increased significantly due to 200+ new houses. Mulbarton services are 1km away with both school and doctors oversubscribed. Bracon Ash has no services, therefore there would be no economic benefit only additional traffic, flooding and loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Footpath to Mulbarton remains unsafe and constrained by private land and substandard carriageway.</p> <p>Requirement to front B1113 is not safe with evidence of recent accidents available. Urban development in rural setting does not meet NPPF objectives 'fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe place, with accessible services'. Design and highway requirements cannot agree. Adverse impacts on BRA1 'would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits', therefore site is not 'justified'. Does not account for approved and proposed industrial development around village (solar farms and pylons).</p> <p>Village not against development in principle. Support Long Lane self-build project and infill developments. Engagement with community has been unanimously negative on previous applications for reasons outlined previously. Negative social impact if introduce urban estate. Negative environmental impact and potential runoff into County Wildlife Site. Large public objection to proposal. Site should be removed.</p>	Please see Council Response ID: 1283 in response to Bracon Ash Residents Group representation ID 3111.
--	----------------------------	----------------------------	---	--

Andrew Cullum	VC ROC1	VC ROC1	<p>Concerned over expanding Settlement Limit to east to give 'preferred site' status for building up to 25 new houses. Until Eel Catcher Close proposals Rockland was mostly ribbon development with tightly drawn Settlement Limit. As ECC was affordable it could be built outside Settlement Limit as Exception Site. Concerns this will lead to further development towards the staithe, pub and Low Road. Meetings with SNC gave assurance there would be no further building on this site as development should not be concentrated in one place. Despite this Eel Catcher Close is stated as setting precedent for development.</p> <p>Area to east has high landscape value with good walking routes and excellent views in all directions. Proposed houses would be obtrusive and would lead to further erosion of landscape from Eel Catcher Close. 25 dwellings on relatively small piece of land will be challenge.</p> <p>If new development run along boundary adjacent to New Inn Hill there will be significant overlooking on existing houses. They may also block natural light in winter months.</p> <p>Village is well supplied with services however these are almost three quarters of a mile away from site. Meaning most of the year a car will be needed. Road will be required to support another 50-75 cars. Road is in a poor state with frequent floods and potholes due to lack of investment. Avoiding this could have a knock-on effect on neighbouring villages.</p> <p>New Inn Hill has sweeping bends, considerable drop and multiple access points, making it poor for further access. NCC officers maintain visibility cannot be achieved and proposal should not go ahead. Lack of detail means accessibility cannot be determined. Speeding is also a significant issue and recent attempts to help pedestrians have been unsuccessful.</p>	Please see the Council Response ID: 1214 and 1237 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
---------------	---------	---------	--	--

Charlotte McIlroy	VC SPO3	VC SPO3	<p>I email reference the planning applications ref 2016/0627, Ref 2018/1772, Ref 2020/1328 and Ref 2022/0095</p> <p>The School Lane site (adjacent to Bluebell Barn) is allocated site under the existing Local Plan as Policy SPO2 and this is to be replaced in the emerging local plan as Policy SPO3 where two essential safeguarding features will be omitted: a pedestrian footpath and the provision of a sustainable drainage system.</p> <p>Any further planning applications on the School Lane site, will be approved without these essential safeguarding inclusions which will compromise resident's highway safety and an increased flood risk. It is of concern that there appears to be no strategic Flood Risk Assessment as stated as a requirement under Reg 19 – it is likely that SPO3 School Lane would fail this evidence-based test and be considered as unsound.</p> <p>The lack of a footpath on School Lane for pedestrian/resident safety. Particularly primary school children with no safe access to the school, and will additionally put drivers at risk.</p> <p>Policy SP02 included the provision of a sustainable drainage system, an attenuation pond, a surface water drainage scheme to ensure that no surface water drains off the site. This has been removed under SPO3 as too has the required Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>This will put our homes and lives at risk of flooding. There are existing flood problems in School Lane as seen in 2019. Current ditch system is fed from current drains which flows under the road. It has a long-term blockage which does not flow to the river. It relies on rainwater to collect in the ditches and drain into the ground. The drains are not able to cope with additional water. The field that is often waterlogged and future development needs to take into account of surface water flooding.</p>	Please see Council response ID: 1181 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
Edward Gosling	VC ROC2	N/A	<p>I recently sent you an email representation concerning VCROC2. On your form I ticked: “<i>Yes I wish to participate in hearing session(s)</i>”. Then when asked (in paragraph 8) to outline why I consider this necessary I simply said: “<i>If you wish me to attend the hearing I’m happy to attend.</i>” While this statement is true I do not believe it is sufficient to answer your question. So my answer to your paragraph 8 question is: “<i>I would like to participate in the hearing session because the issue I am raising includes numerical/statistical data and I believe that this, and other information in my submission, is better communicated in a social environment. I also believe our mutual understandings of the issues would benefit from a two-way conversation</i>”</p>	The Council notes this representation.
Mr S Mayhew and Mrs R Mayhew	Policies Map for Woodton and Bedingham.	Policies Map for Woodton and Bedingham.	<p>Landowner of sites SN0268SL and SN0262SL (Land north of Church Road, Woodton) supports the site assessment conclusions that the combined sites are reasonable for allocation. Confident a scheme could be designed that would not result in any adverse impacts on nearby heritage assets and would deliver benefits to the village, including market and affordable housing.</p> <p>However the sites are not currently proposed for allocation. Instead WOO1 has been proposed, which is not contested.</p> <p>Wish to confirm these sites remain available for development and should be considered as a contingency site should others not come forward or come forward with less housing than proposed.</p>	<p>The Council notes the support for these sites and the site assessments.</p> <p>SN0268SL and SN0262SL in combination have been listed as a Reasonable Alternative for development within Woodton.</p>

Gillingham Parish Council (Tina Newby)	VC GIL1	VC GIL1REV	<p>No infrastructure in place since the last development. Concern over sewage infrastructure. Concern over flood issues and tidal flooding.</p> <p>Over development on what already is a dangerous road. The Street is the main street in the village and at the best of times has cars parked by the residents house's, causing the road to become single lane. There is a tight bend in the road that could be very dangerous. Perhaps need to look at a separate road into the village.</p> <p>When will the second part be planned for? There is already need of a bigger school.</p> <p>Increasing the development of the new Daisy Way using just one access road into the already dangerous road The Street. Perhaps a separate road coming from a different part of the village, to reduce the traffic flow through The Street.</p> <p>Quiet village with no streetlights boasts the lovely night sky. There is already problems with some light pollution.</p>	Please see Council Response ID: 1482 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
Geldeston Parish Council (Tina Newby)	VC GEL1	VC GEL1	<p>Population now approximately 650 with recent development of 13 dwellings.</p> <p>Access now very restricted as only one road allows two-way traffic, but eventually all roads restricted to single file. Infrastructure and facilities struggling to cope, especially with summer tourists. Limited parking and medical facilities due to large population and low numbers of staff. Situation needs to improve before further population growth. High demand due to unique location and facilities. Question if enough jobs in area or would require commuting. Beccles will also struggle with current proposals there.</p> <p>Parish Council would be against further development of Kells Meadow. If it does go ahead, need to be separate access from Yarmouth Road.</p> <p>There are 17 properties with a mix of types, including a social provision. If there are to be houses on the Kells Way top field then scrutinising the detail at the next stage is vital; it should be challenged to ensure the housing density and type are suitable for the land topography and our current infrastructure provision. So far, yet to see any evidence of improvement plans for Highways, Drainage, Education, Public Transport or Medical Facilities.</p>	<p>Please see the Council Response ID: 1481 for responses to issues raised in this representation.</p> <p>The proportion of affordable housing will be determined by the relevant policies in the Greater Norwich Local Plan, with specific details being developed through the eventual planning application.</p> <p>Infrastructure and service providers have been engaged throughout the preparation of the VCHAP. No issues have been raised by any providers that would mean development could not take place on this site.</p>

Jayne Forbes	VC ROC1	VC ROC1	<p>Recently came to attention that plans for SN2007 and part of SN0531 have changed and now 25 houses are proposed on a much larger plot instead of 15 on a smaller plot, these will also be private housing not social housing.</p> <p>While my initial objections still stand, I wish to raise that large private housing in a Broads setting is very likely to attract 'second home' owners. What steps if any will be taken to prevent this? Also if the homes are large high value dwellings then they are unlikely to be affordable to the local community that needs them.</p> <p>Also interested in longer term effects. Last year the Environment Agency and Natural England identified significant risks to the Broads Special Area of Conservation regarding Nutrient Neutrality and it was my understanding that Local Planning Authorities had been advised on their obligations.</p> <p>Has South Norfolk Council conducted a Habitats Regulations Assessment? What steps have been taken to mitigate the nutrient load on Rockland St Mary Broad & Surlingham Broad both of which failed nutrient tests and require quite a considerable reduction? Are these not within the catchment area of this development - especially considering it is less than 250 metres from Rockland Staithe.</p> <p>Is this still the same application (SN2007) since area has now doubled and houses increased to 25. Finding application on website has proven impossible.</p>	<p>Please see the Council Response ID: 1214 for responses to issues raised in this representation.</p> <p>VC ROC1 is currently recommended by the Council as an allocation. There is currently no application on the site.</p>
Adrian and Christine Muttitt	VC ELL1 and VC ELL2	VC ELL1 and VC ELL2	<p>Mill Road in Ellingham has ongoing problems with blocked sewers. Nearby manholes are filled and have overflowed recently. Anglian Water has been called out recently. Anglian Water need to identify the fault in the main sewer pipe. Proposed houses south of Mill Road and Florence Way may well create extra issues which are not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Mill Road itself is very narrow with a sharp bend with a lot of footfall and school traffic. It is not possible for large vehicles to pass a car, and certainly not two large vehicles together. Blind bend at playing field entrance is extremely dangerous, with high hedge making visibility even more of an issue. Proposal may generate another 100 vehicles which Mill Road cannot accommodate.</p> <p>Potholes also created by large vehicles. Large vehicles also have to mount pavements to enable passing. Cars often do not adhere to speed limits.</p> <p>Heavy rain often pools where new exit for housing is proposed.</p> <p>Still no pavement opposite junction at Mill Lane/Road. May be difficult to deliver this due to land ownership. No continuation of pavement on south side of Mill Road as apparently agreed as part of recent housing development.</p> <p>Consultation needs to be seen to be working, not just rubber stamping.</p>	<p>Please see Council response ID: 1338 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.</p>

Wheatacre Burgh St. Peter Parish Council (Simon Solomon)	VC BUR1	VC BUR1	<p>All present at Parish Council meeting opposed to proposed development.</p> <p>Not supported by any specific development management policy which allows for development outside of settlement boundary. Having regard to harm to character weighed against limited benefits, it is not considered to deliver overriding benefits required by Policy DM 1.3.</p> <p>Proposed development will erode the landscape character, which has few buildings on this side of road. Proposal would be out of keeping with open nature of surrounding area and harmful to immediate setting, form and character of local area and this part of South Norfolk. Therefore does not satisfy Policy 2 of Joint Core Strategy.</p>	<p>The Council does not consider the issues raised to relate to the soundness of the plan.</p> <p>The potential impact on the landscape character is addressed in paragraph 43.28 of the VCHAP and specific landscaping requirements have been included within Policy VC BUR1.</p> <p>The VCHAP has been prepared alongside the Greater Norwich Local Plan, which sets out the principle for the VCHAP in paragraphs 30 and 31. The GNLP will replace the Joint Core Strategy and the Council considers that the VCHAP is consistent with the policies within the GNLP.</p> <p>As stated in paragraph A.6 of the VCHAP the Plan has been underpinned by paragraph 79 of the NPPF which outlines the need to support rural communities with appropriate development. The Council considers that Policy VC BUR1 will support the sustainability of Wheatacre and Burgh St Peter without any detrimental impact on the landscape as set out above.</p>
---	---------	---------	--	---

Nigel Bond (on behalf of Richard and Nigel Bond)	VC WOR1	VC WOR1	<p>Joint owners of land at High Road, Wortwell together with land south of High Road, Wortwell making up VC WOR1.</p> <p>Entered into conversation with community and Parish Council at Wortwell for almost two years. Proposal has constantly been adapted and improved over that time to the development we now present.</p> <p>Also took into account request for dog exercising area to the north of Mill Hill.</p> <p>Believe this is a well thought out and deliverable projects which will provide much needed commercial and affordable housing and an asset to Wortwell.</p>	<p>The Council notes this representation and welcome the support for Policy VC WOR1.</p> <p>The Council is aware that the landowner of Policy VC WOR1 has promoted an area of land for a dog walking site. However, this has not been part of the consideration of the merits of the site.</p>
Mrs Jill Donley	Unknown	Unknown	<p>Doubtless more groups of housing are needed in the area. Emphasise the need for sensitivity when urban areas replace greens spaces.</p> <p>Need good air and sensitive, relevant footprints on the ground. Infrastructure needed to constructively introduce new communities to the area. Any development must be fit for purpose.</p> <p>Please consider the following needing to be in place prior to development: doctor practice (mobile clinic?), police presence, inter-denominational/inter-faith indoor space/facilities, public phone box, separate adult and children's outdoor recreation facilities, bus service and adequate drainage.</p>	<p>The Council notes this representation.</p> <p>Key infrastructure providers, such as Norfolk County Council, Anglian Water and the NHS have been consulted throughout the preparation of the VCHAP. Any requirements they have identified to support development have been included as site specific requirements within the policies of the VCHAP.</p>

Anonymous	SN5017	SN5017	<p>I write with reference to “Surlingham, Bramerton & Kirby Bedon Village Cluster Site Assessment Form” and in particular, the site reference SN5017 at Bramerton.</p> <p>I find the council document to be extremely thorough and objective. It clearly states multiple reasons that this site should not be considered and in my view I find the document to be legally correct, of sound argument and inclusive of views. This piece of farming land that is used for grazing is wholly inappropriate for housing for all the reasons sited.</p> <p>Sited on an ancient lane that has significant local historical interest and is not suitable for more than 3-4 cars per day that use it. Exemplified with Surlingham Road being shut temporarily and many more cars are using this Lane and causing destruction to the local hedgerows and verges, congestion where cars meet as there are no passing places for 1/2 mile, and many instances of ramblers and dog walkers having to get out of the way of a speeding vehicle.</p> <p>The Lane is an important route in the National Cycle routes (1) joining Yarmouth with Norwich and many cyclists use this route. There are no services apart from electricity and telephone wires.</p> <p>Dark skies enjoyed in Bramerton and Kirby Bedon which is at risk with further development. Area has a rural character with rural cottages in open countryside, which would be destroyed if this site was developed.</p> <p>I commend the council for refusing this housing application and fully support their rationale.</p>	The Council notes this representation and welcomes the support for the site assessment.
Geoffrey and Kathleen Shaw	SN5017	SN5017	<p>Representation in reference to SN5017</p> <p>Understand that a proposal for development has been put forward by the landowner, which was rejected by South Norfolk Council on 24th April 2022.</p> <p>Wish to record our agreement to the Council’s conclusion and rejection of this proposal.</p>	The Council notes this representation.

Mrs Jane Henry	Unknown	Unknown	<p>Object to building any new housing in Norfolk.</p> <p>Constantly being advised of water shortages in Norfolk yet we still build large houses with multiple bathrooms. Not only uses more water but adds to runoff into drainage systems. Have Anglian water approved this?</p> <p>Numerous leaks due to inefficient pipe network. Water infrastructure is outdated and yet more houses are being proposed.</p> <p>We also have over 5 thousand empty houses in Norfolk.</p>	<p>The Council does not consider the issues raised to relate to the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>Anglian Water has been engaged throughout the preparation of the VCHAP. This has involved discussions and requests for comments on the allocated sites. The comments from these discussions as well as any comments from the Regulation 19 consultation from Anglian Water have been acted upon and any necessary water infrastructure improvements have been included within the policies of the VCHAP.</p> <p>The preparation of the GNLP established the objectively assessed needs for the Greater Norwich area including that required to be delivered through the VCHAP.</p>
Francesca Innes	VC BRE1	VC BRE1	<p>Neither myself or any local resident were informed about this plan. Only found out when a very vague leaflet was put through our doors.</p> <p>Bressingham is too small to take 40 houses. The pub quoted in the document is actually the Chequers Restaurant and Bar which is family run and is only open 4 days a week. The garden centre is fully staffed and the primary school is full as is Roydon. Doctors in Diss are taking no more patients. No services except for very small shop. Therefore this is unlawful.</p> <p>Very small sewerage plant that services local houses, so all new houses will need soak aways. If road is widened the dykes will need to be filled in which will causes flooding.</p> <p>Quiet village with older residents who do not wish to be disturbed by 40 new families with nothing to do. Park only has very small play equipment and not fit for purpose for small amount of children already in village.</p>	<p>Please see Council Response ID: 1233 for responses to most of the issues raised in this representation.</p> <p>The Councils notes the comments raised in relation to the services in Bressingham.</p>

Mrs Carol Stephens	VC BAW1	VC BAW1REV	<p>Valuable agricultural land being used for more housing when should be retained to feed existing population. Already too much traffic on narrow roads. Historic bridge over river not suitable for heavy vehicles. Drainage issues with existing housing which has to be unblocked twice a year. Village susceptible to flooding and open land helps prevent it draining into river. New housing already developed on Stocks Hill and more would be unsuitable with no bus services and access to park and ride is dangerous with no pavements or lighting. Hospital overwhelmed and difficult to access healthcare. Too many villages being spoilt when being told how important green spaces are for mental health and wildlife.</p>	<p>Please see Council Response ID: 1133 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.</p> <p>It should be noted that this site has been revised as part of the Regulation 18 Consultation on Alternative Sites and Focused Changes. The site has been increased from 1.4ha to 1.9ha, whilst remaining for 35 dwellings, to give scope for future proposals to address the village location, adjoining Conservation Area and the wider river valley landscape in a more sympathetic way.</p>
Christopher Brighton	SN2183	SN2183	<p>Representations relate to site at Wymondham Road, Wreningham.</p> <p>Objection to the proposed site REF: SN2183 for inclusion in the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan.</p> <p>Site is out of scale and character and would require extending beyond existing Settlement Limit. Wymondham Road is not used often due to blind bends and narrow carriageway. Therefore the proposed site is the worst possible location as all traffic would need to pass through the village centre. Similar situation with Ashwellthorpe Road, Mill Lane, Church Road and Hethel Road. Road network is inadequate to cope with increased traffic. Using private driveways as passing places is unacceptable.</p> <p>‘Reasoned justification’ for site being to mirror opposite side of road is disingenuous as this consists of only 4 properties served by private road. New development will only exacerbate existing issues with road width and large vehicles needing to pass.</p> <p>There is no village shop and school is over subscribed.</p> <p>Other potential development identified on former Spratts Coach site and Hethel Road. Therefore facilities will be further strained and there is no need for further unacceptable development. Also question if existing sewerage could cope with development.</p> <p>‘Suitability Assessment’ states that carriageway should be widened for frontage and access, which would be incongruent with village.</p>	<p>The Council notes this representation. Site SN2183 has been determined to be a reasonable alternative however has not been allocated due to the number of constraints identified by technical consultees.</p>

Angie Yeomans and Tony Steggles	SN5017	SN5017	<p>Site reference SN5017, Easthill Lane, Bramerton</p> <p>We both agree with the District Council report, dated 28/04/2022, that we recently received a copy of, that site reference SN5017, Easthill Lane, Bamerton, is not suitable for development.</p> <p>We also support the decision that the site, Land north of Church Farm, was deemed unreasonable.</p>	The Council notes this representation.
Alison Crosskill	Alpington, Yelverton and Bergh Apton	Alpington, Yelverton and Bergh Apton	<p>Representations relate to Mill Road, Alpington</p> <p>Increased traffic in Alpington due to housing and business development. At present is manageable and fairly safe to walk and cycle. Fear that 25 new dwellings will change this. Do not have the infrastructure to cope with this many more people or cars. Understand more houses are required and could accept around 5 dwellings on old concrete works in Bergh Apton but any more than this would drastically change the dynamics of our village and detrimental impacts on the countryside and wildlife.</p>	Please see Council Response ID: 1030 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
I. Smith	Unknown	Unknown	<p>What we have desperately need are affordable rented properties owned by non-profit housing association. This region is awash with houses on developments everywhere that few locals can afford. Absolutely no more houses except to replace council houses which lower paid workers can afford.</p>	The Council notes this representation. The VCHAP will form one part of the development plan for the Great Norwich area alongside the Greater Norwich Local Plan. The GNLP includes a policy on affordable housing (Policy 5) and therefore it is not considered necessary to repeat this policy within the VCHAP.
Diane Smith	Mulbarton, Bracon Ash, Swardeston and East Carleton	Mulbarton, Bracon Ash, Swardeston and East Carleton	<p>In respect to the Mulbarton, Swardeston and Bracon Ash plan (no. 15), I am supportive of the sites identified however there needs to be more investment into the village infrastructure i.e. primary care medical facilities and community spaces to support further increase in housing.</p>	The Council notes this representation.

Respondent	Representation ID	Regulation 19 Addendum Section/ Policy/ Paragraph	Submission Document Section/ Policy/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Changes to Plan	Council Response
Mr Mark Tudor [20515]	4227	Schedule of other major changes	Table at Paragraph 1A. 10	<p>NPPF (December 2023) has removed the need for housing targets and the need for the VCAHP to 'fill the gap'. New proposal now exists to calculate housing need based on advisory starting point, therefore no gap exists and no need for buffer. Therefore the allocation in Bawburgh can be removed without any impact on GNLP.</p> <p>Site was not allocated in previous Local Plan, sits outside development boundary and provides no overriding benefit.</p>	Development in Bawburgh is unnecessary.	The December 2023 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does not remove the requirement for local authorities to plan for new housing. It still states that local authorities should assess housing need based on the standard method in national planning guidance, which is what the GNLP does. Only in exceptional circumstances should another approach be taken. No exceptional circumstances have been identified for the Greater Norwich area, and the GNLP was therefore adopted in March 2024 with the requirement for at least 1,200 homes in the South Norfolk Village Cluster. The 2015 Site Specific Allocations and Policies document only covers the period to March 2026, the VCHAP is therefore due to be in place by late 2025, to replace those parts of the 2015 document relating to Bawburgh.

Mr Mark Tudor [20515]	4228	Paragraph 2.3	Paragraph 6.3	Bawburgh is recognised as not having a range of services and facilities and is not part of a 'Cluster'. It has a once per day bus service and no infrastructure to support large scale development.	Development in Bawburgh is unnecessary.	The requirement for a range of smaller sites, as opposed to the large urban extensions at Easton, Costessey, Cringleford etc., comes from the NPPF, although it is also referenced in paragraph A.7 in the Introduction to the VCHAP. The Council does not select the developers of the sites. The Council allocates the land and seeks assurances that the site is deliverable, but it is for the landowner to dispose of the site how they wish. In terms of legal process, the preparation of the VCHAP is the legal process, which will involve any outstanding issues being dealt with by a Government appointed Planning Inspector.
--------------------------	------	---------------	---------------	---	---	---

Mr Mark Tudor [20515]	4229	VC BAW1 REV	VC BAW1 REV	<p>Site is not small and more recent developments of 6-10 units have been proportionate. These have been at 9 dwellings per hectare whereas this site is 18 with no justification. It would appear that the developer has been 'hand picked' to secure the site and the allocation of the site does not appear to follow any legal process.</p> <p>What consultation has taken place to increase the area from 1.4ha to 1.97ha?</p> <p>Land is Grade 3A and is not appropriate for development. How will the new footpath be maintained and policed?</p> <p>Site sits within the Southern Bypass Protection Zone, is at the highest part of the village and will be clearly visible across Yare Valley.</p>	Development in Bawburgh is unnecessary.	<p>The consultation to increase the size of the site from 1.4ha to 1.97ha was held between December 2023 and February 2024, to which we have a response from you.</p> <p>In terms of Agricultural Land classification, a separate assessment has not been conducted; the land is classified as Grade 3 on the national dataset, as such it could be either 3a or 3b. In any event, the area needed for this allocation does not prejudice the agricultural use of the rest of the field.</p> <p>We will take your concerns about the new footpath to the school as a representation to that change in the Addendum document.</p> <p>Lastly in terms of the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone, this has been taken into account as part of the assessment of the site and a Landscape and Visual Appraisal is available as part of the consultation material. Again, we will take agricultural land classification and landscape impact as representations on the change to the site area in the Addendum.</p>
Mr Andrew Grosvenor [20272]	3847	Policy VC WIC2	Policy VC WIC2	This site contains the water run off for our combined sewage system Ashcroft House sewage system for 9 houses. I have written previously and been assured this would be secured by the developers but I don't see any reference to this by the developers or Anglia Water. This needs to be fully planned for prior to development.	None stated.	Please see Council Response ID: 1038 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.

Mrs Sallyann Weston [19134]	3850	Policy VC WIC2	Policy VC WIC2	Access to this site is between two sharp bends and also an area where parents park at school drop off and pick up times. I cannot see how, even with landscaping, a safe access can be possible here without increasing the risk of accidents to both vehicles and pedestrians. Again, the main sewerage runs behind the houses on the opposite side of the road, how will the site be able to access the mains?	None stated.	Please see Council Response IDs: 1036 and 1863 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
Mr Anthony Ridley [20021]	3855	Habitats Regulation Assessment	Habitats Regulation Assessment	Large colony of bats in woodland immediately adjacent to part of the proposed development in Burgh St Peter.	None stated.	Please see Council response ID:1075 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
Tasburgh Parish Council (Clerk) [13006]	3857	Policy VC TAS1REV	VC TAS1REV	We wish to submit comments re-iterating our previous objection to the continuous access from Church Road to Henry Preston Road which is still deemed to be unsafe and advocates a dangerous loop between Church Road and Henry Preston Road passing the school.	'vehicular access from Church Road only and pedestrian/cycle access from Henry Preston Road'	Please see Council response ID:1282 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
Mrs Mary Dorrell [15168]	3868	Services and Facilities, Paragraph 1.8	Services and Facilities, Paragraph 4.8	Barford 1.1 ... You state: "The most sensitive area of the village is situated on either side of Cock Street where the Hall and its grounds on the west side and the **popular** plantation on the east side." This open area may be "popular", but I think you mean that they are poplar trees?? Although I think that they are actually Bat Willows (and harvested as such). The fact that over the months/years this simple typo has not been proofread and corrected fills me with despair as to the limited attention to detail the Planning Authority have accorded our community.	Please proofread your submissions.	The Council does not consider this to relate to the Soundness of the VCHAP. This is grammatical error that can be corrected as a minor modification to the Plan.
Mr Martin Henry [20466]	3877	VC BAR2	VC BAR2	.	None stated.	No response required.
Mr Martin Henry [20466]	3878	VC BAR2, Paragraph 1.21	VC BAR2. Paragraph 4.21	.	None stated.	No response required.

Broads Authority (Ms Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [12415]	4210	Part 2, Schedule of other major changes, Table at paragraph 1A.10	VC HAD1	HAD1 Land south of Haddiscoe Manor Farm Don't need the word 'that' in the first sentence, it doesn't make sense of the bullet points following.	HAD1 Land south of Haddiscoe Manor Farm Don't need the word 'that' in the first sentence, it doesn't make sense of the bullet points following.	The Council does not consider this to relate to the Soundness of the VCHAP. If considered necessary, this could be included as a minor modification to the Plan.
Mr John Lowe [19349]	3888	Policy VC WIC2	Policy VC WIC2	A very poor site proposal owing to the position on two blind bends and adjacent to the village school which suffers from severe parking problems during school time as Saxon Road is reputed to run from the Church across the site. Also previous owners of the site had the site investigated for drainage for potential development and was found to be not suitable owing to a high water table.	Site needs to be carefully investigated regarding the above.	Please see Council response ID:1036 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
Norfolk County Council – Minerals and Waste Team (Ms Caroline Jeffery, Principal Planner) [20338]	3981	Policy VC SWA2REV	Policy VC SWA2REV	Policy VC SWA2 is currently unsound as it is inconsistent with NPPF paragraph 218 and the adopted policy CS16 of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. Proposed allocation VC SWA2 is over 2ha in size and underlain by 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. The Mineral Planning Authority recognises that reference to the underlain mineral resource has been included in the supporting text, however, we request inclusion of a requirement in the policy itself.	The policy wording for this site should be amended to include the following as a policy requirement: '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.'	The Council notes the comment of the Mineral Planning Authority but does not consider this to be a soundness matter. The Council has included within the supporting policy text reference to the site being underlain, or partially underlain by safeguarded resources and has highlighted the need for development to comply with the relevant policy within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. It is not considered necessary to repeat this information within the site-specific text as all development is required to comply with the requirements of the Local Plan, which includes the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [19732]	3998	Policy VC BAW1REV	Policy VC BAW1REV	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within this site, the site lies immediately to the south of the boundary of the Bawburgh Conservation Area. Any development of this site therefore has the potential to affect the Conservation area and its setting including views into and out of the Conservation area.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of an HIA for the site. The HIA makes several recommendations. These have been included in bullet point 2 and 4 which is welcomed. As previously highlighted, bullet point 3 states that the HER should be consulted to determine the need for any archaeological surveys prior to development. However, this is different to the recommendation in the HIA which states that 'Require investigation on the proposed site prior to development commencing to identify and further historic activity'.</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>	Please see Council response ID:1199 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [19732]	4198	Policy VC BRA1	Policy VC BRA1	<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 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>	Please see Council response ID:1287 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [19732]	4000	Policy VC SPO1REV	Policy VC SPO1REV	<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>	Please see Council response ID:1186 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.

Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [19732]	4003	Policy VC TAC2	Policy VC TAC2	<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>	Please see Council response ID:1157 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [19732]	4203	Policy VC WIC2	Policy VC WIC2	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets on this site, the grade I listed church of All Saints and the grade II listed war memorial lie to the north of the site. However, the intervening trees provide an effective screen to the site. We suggested that additional planting along the northern boundary of the site would help to safeguard the setting of the church.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome bullet points 1 and 2 of the policy.</p>	None stated.	The Council welcomes the support for this policy.
Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [19732]	4004	Part 2, Schedule of other major changes	Policy VC WIC3	<p>Representation relates to VC WIC3:</p> <p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets on this site, the grade I listed church of All Saints and the grade II listed war memorial lie to the south of the site. The grade II listed Old Mill House lies to the west of the site. Therefore, any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the significance of these heritage assets through development within the setting of the assets.</p> <p>There is a degree of separation of the site from the church.</p> <p>We do appreciate that this is an existing allocation and it has a planning application pending determination.</p> <p>We welcome the second bullet point relating to the landscaping and the church and its setting.</p>	None stated.	The Council welcomes the support for this policy.

Mrs Glynis Watling [19920]	3973	Services and Facilities, Paragraph 2.3	Services and Facilities, Paragraph 6.3	<p>5. The proposed entrance and exit is situated opposite two other exits and next to ours.</p> <p>6. The proposed plans are for the gardens to be up against our hedge. This will again impact on our privacy.</p> <p>7. The footpath on Stocks Hill is too narrow for passing pushchairs etc causing people to step into the road.</p>	<p>1. reduce the number of dwellings. No more than 10.</p> <p>2. keep them all single storey so as to maintain privacy.</p> <p>3. Move the proposed entrance and exit to the other end of the development.</p> <p>4. Move the proposed site further back and have more trees and greenery to the front of the development in keeping with the village surroundings.</p>	Please see Council response ID:1133 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
-------------------------------	------	---	---	--	---	--

Water Management Alliance (Ms Phillipa Nanson, Sustainable Development Officer) [20327]	4113 - 4122	Relevant policies/sections stated in summary	Relevant policies/sections stated in summary	<p>VC WOR2, SN0274REVB, SN2118: Minor development – no further comments.</p> <p>VC BAR1, VC SPO1REV, VC BAW1REV, VC SWA2REV, VC ROC1, VC TAC1REV, VC TAS1REV, SN0262, VC BB1, SN0274REVA, VC BRO1, VC WIN2, VC HAL1, VC PSM1, SN0488, VC ALP1, VC ASH1, SN0433, SN055, VC MUL1: 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> <p>SN2065REV, SN3019SL: Major development - A riparian watercourse is located to the north of the proposed site which feeds into a Main River within 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).</p> <p>SN2036: A Board maintained watercourse is located to the east of the proposed site boundary. Byelaw 3 applies to any proposed discharge of surface water from the proposed site. All other Board Byelaws will also apply to this development.</p> <p>SN4069SL, SN0348: There are a series of riparian watercourses to the south of the proposed site. Byelaw 3 applies to any proposed discharge of surface water from the proposed site. All other Board Byelaws will also apply to this development.</p> <p>SN2183: A number of riparian watercourses are located to the east and south of the proposed site. If surface water discharges within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD, we request</p>	None stated.	The Council notes the representations submitted by the Water Management Alliance. The Council has engaged with Norfolk County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority and Anglian Water throughout the preparation of the VCHAP. The Council has also commissioned a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to support the Plan. Recommendations from all of these sources have been incorporated into site-specific policies where relevant.
--	-------------	--	--	--	--------------	--

				that this discharge is facilitated in line with the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).		
<p>Bennett Homes [19097]</p> <p>Agent: Lanpro Services Ltd (Mr Charles Judson) [20483]</p>	4200	Policy VC SWA1	Policy VC SWA1	<p>Bennett Homes continues to support the allocation of VC SWA1 for residential development.</p> <p>Bennett Homes previously promoted the allocation of an additional 0.6ha of land to enable the delivery of an additional 10 residential dwellings at the Site. For the reasons set out in this previous representation, Bennett Homes maintains that Policy VC SWA1 should be extended to include the additional 0.6ha and uplift the number of dwellings allocated through this policy from 20 to 30. This suggested increase in site area and number of dwellings is supported by the consultation on amendments to the NPPF which commenced on 2 August 2024 and closed on 24th September 2024.</p> <p>This consultation seeks to amend the standard method for calculating housing supply, increasing the annual housing requirement over the Greater Norwich Local Plan area from 1,929 to 2,647 dwellings per annum. Allocating additional housing to support this increased housing requirement would be consistent with the objective of the NPPF.</p>	Bennett Homes maintains that Policy VC SWA1 should be extended to include the additional 0.6ha and uplift the number of dwellings allocated through this policy from 20 to 30.	Please see Council response ID:1318 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
Mrs Lucy McKay [20495]	4058	Policy VC BAR1	Policy VC BAR1	X	X	No response required.
Ben Herring [20336]	4069	Policy VC BAR1	Policy VC BAR1	I think it is important to note here that it is my understanding that this site is not available for sale, and hence the site would not be viable.	Ensure that the site is actually available for development.	Please see Council response ID:1874 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.

Mrs Karen Dunn [19584]	4078	Policy VC SPO3	Policy VC SPO3	<p>This Addendum Consultation does not address the significant safety issues that impact this site under adopted SNCLP Policy SP02 and VCSP03. To provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A sustainable urban drainage system ensuring no surface water drains off the site (there are existing flood issues). - A pedestrian refuge/footpath to the school (this cannot be met as insufficient road width). <p>Objections submitted include the S.Row Community Council, and concerns from the NCC Strategic Planning Team with inadequate scope for highway improvements. It doesn't wish to support re-allocation of the site and requests that VC SP03 is removed from the draft Local Plan.</p>	To take seriously the concerns and requests of the Objectors. There are also issues of accountability.	Please see Council response ID:1181 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
------------------------	------	----------------	----------------	--	--	--

<p>Rainier Development s and Strategic Land [20498]</p> <p>Agent: Ceres Property (Mr Sam Hollingworth, Associate Partner) [20500]</p>	<p>4127</p>	<p>Part 2, Schedule of other major changes, Table at paragraph 1A.10</p>	<p>The Assessment of Sites</p>	<p>Site selection process: Council have been provided with additional information, such as Vision Document, for GNLP3033, which was considered a reasonable alternative. It therefore has merit for consideration, but there is no evidence it was considered for Addendum and may have been prematurely rejected.</p> <p>Rejection of GNLP3033: LSAB - no issues relating to access, accessibility of core services, no contamination, no impact on ecological sites, no impact on listed buildings.</p> <p>Further comments - network concern at A140/Swan Lane but no further detail.</p> <p>All potential options for Long Stratton have been rejected seemingly on the basis of the scale of growth already allocated to Long Stratton. However, no evidence is put forward as to why it would be unsustainable to provide any further, relatively modest additions to this growth.</p> <p>Additionally, it should be recognised that the extent of growth allocated for Long Stratton arises from the Long Stratton Area Action Plan – a plan that was adopted over 8 years ago now. Any strategic approach to Long Stratton clearly requires reviewing, and particularly in the context of the VCHAP now needing to identify additional / alternative sites for development.</p> <p>The failure to consider potential options for growth at Long Stratton, despite the LSAB identifying three potential sites for development there, renders the Regulation 19 Addendum unjustified. Further, given the potential for such an option to have delivered growth in what is clearly a sustainable location for residential development, the approach results in the Regulation 19 Addendum being</p>	<p>In considering additional / alternative sites for the VCHAP, the 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. A Vision Document has been prepared demonstrating how it would contribute to sustainable development in the District, and that it is a deliverable site.</p>	<p>The Council does not consider the issues raised to relate to the Soundness of the VCHAP. Sites GNLP3033 is located within Long Stratton which does not form part of the VCHAP and has been included within the Greater Norwich Local Plan as a Key Service Centre/Village. Therefore this site have not been considered for allocation as part of the preparation of the VCHAP.</p>
---	-------------	--	--------------------------------	--	--	--

				inconsistent with the NPPF and its exhortation to delivery sustainable development.		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

<p>Rainier Development s and Strategic Land [20498]</p> <p>Agent: Ceres Property (Mr Sam Hollingworth, Associate Partner) [20500]</p>	<p>4170</p>	<p>Part 2, Schedule of other major changes, Table at paragraph 1A.10</p>	<p>The Assessment of Sites</p>	<p>Site Assessments:</p> <p>Whilst neither GNLP0321 nor GNLP1032 was proposed to be allocated in the original submitted version of the VCHAP or are allocated in the GNLP, the background to this is, as well as the Council's assessment of these sites, is considered relevant to their consideration as part of the Regulation 19 Addendum.</p> <p>Poringland/Framingham Earl is a Key Service Village in GNLP. However, no allocations in the GNLP referring to existing commitments.</p> <p>We consider that at the point it became apparent the VCHAP would have to allocate additional / alternative sites to that within the original Regulation 19 draft, the Site should have been reconsidered, given it was a reasonable alternative through the GNLP plan-making process and it is within the administrative area covered by the VCHAP.</p> <p>Rejection of GNLP0321 and GNLP1032: Both sites assessed with broadly positive outcomes and considered suitable.</p> <p>However sites were rejected due to infrastructure and environmental constraints and existing commitments, and limit of 400-600 new dwellings in this sector or hierarchy. No justification for this limit.</p> <p>We have seen no evidence that the VCHAP has revisited potential options for growth around settlements such as Poringland / Framingham.</p> <p>Issues raised are those that are generally capable of being mitigated (e.g. surface water and impact on setting of a listed building are matters that are commonly addressed through planning applications) and those for which no substantive</p>	<p>Having regard to all of the above, we consider that in order for the Regulation 19 Addendum to be sound, it will be necessary to reconsider potential allocations to villages such as Poringland / Framingham Earl. The adopted Development Plan points towards the northern end of the village as being the most suitable area to accommodate growth of the village. The Site is not only located within this strategically advantageous area, but, as the PSAD confirms, it is a reasonable alternative meriting consideration.</p>	<p>The Council does not consider the issues raised to relate to the Soundness of the VCHAP. Sites GNLP0321 and GNLP1032 are located within Framingham Earl/Poringland, which are areas that do not form part of the VCHAP and have been included within the Greater Norwich Local Plan as a Key Service Centre/Village. Therefore these sites have not been considered for allocation as part of the preparation of the VCHAP.</p>
---	-------------	--	--------------------------------	---	--	--

				<p>evidence has been put forward to support (e.g. that existing commitments have resulted have limited the potential for additional new housing in Poringland).</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the Council may determine larger allocations.</p> <p>If growth is to be directed to Poringland, it is logical that it is located at the northern end of the village, such that traffic movements associated with journeys to and from Norwich are not directed through the centre of the village. This is acknowledged in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Ms Mary Wilkinson [20170]	4163	Policy VC BAW1REV	Policy VC BAW1REV	<p>I agree with all the objections made by Parish Councillor, Tony Collins, on behalf of Bawburgh Parish Council, in his letter of 1 October.</p> <p>The design of the houses may be appropriate for suburbia but does not 'honour the traditional Norfolk style' as the developers claim, and certainly does not blend into the environment. The houses with cream rendering will really stand out, as will those with red blend brickwork and the 'Georgian' style houses, some with obtrusive pseudo 'porticos'. The two recent developments, the Warren and St Walstan's Meadow, are small scale, single-storey, and unobtrusive. A development of 35 houses adjacent to the conservation area will be much more visible because of the position and size of the site, and the style of the properties. There are no single-storey homes so there is no provision at all for older people, or anyone with a disability or mobility problem. The chalet bungalows (described as 1.5 storey) will be virtually the same height as the two-storey houses. Given the prices of Bawburgh properties currently on the market it is unlikely that the 'affordable homes' will be actually affordable to the people who really need them.</p> <p>There will be a significant increase in road traffic, given the lack of facilities in Bawburgh. The plans showed that in addition to 1, 2 and 3 bedroomed properties referred to in the feedback form, there were also 4 and 5 bedroomed houses, apparently with two or three allocated car spaces each. Stocks Hill is already a rat-run, and a development of 35 houses will increase the traffic hazards on the brow of the hill, as drivers routinely ignore the 20mph speed limit. Drivers coming into the village from the Watton Road, speed up once they are through the chicanes.</p>	I think the plan should be modified to permit no more than 15 single-storey units designed to fit the setting of a small Norfolk village.	Please see Council response ID:1133 for responses to the issues raised in this representation.
------------------------------	------	----------------------	----------------------	---	---	--

				<p>The developers claim to 'give back' to the communities where they have built housing. This is an admirable intention, but the examples on their website of the 'donations' they have made to other communities show they wouldn't compensate for the disadvantages a development of this size and type would bring to Bawburgh. It would change irrevocably the character of a unique South Norfolk village.</p>		
<p>Quinn Construction (Mr Ian Neave) [18933]</p>	<p>4190</p>	<p>Part 2, Schedule of other major changes, Table at paragraph 1A.10</p>	<p>The Assessment of Sites</p>	<p>There has been an article in the Daily Telegraph this week that said there are proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework that will include proposed changes in relation to brownfield development and to review low quality grey built sites through green belt reviews.</p> <p>Should this go through there could be some transitional arrangements therefore a possible early review of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Would you please therefore give further consideration to our site (SN4065SL) bearing in mind we have had a horse, two stables, feed shed and tack room on this site for many years and this may then be construed as a grey site.</p> <p>On a separate note it has been brought to my attention East Pye Solar are proposing to erect Photo Voltaics on the land that backs onto our site.</p> <p>These type of sites are generally allocated for low quality land.</p> <p>Interesting!!</p>	<p>However, consideration should be given to allocating /extending less suitable sites in relation to brown field development and low quality grey build sites, outside village boundaries that are next to or adjacent solar projects supplying national targets to decarbonise our electric system.</p>	<p>The Council does not consider the issues raised to relate to the Soundness of the VCHAP. The site referred to in the representation was rejected at the site assessment stage due to the site being over 1km from the Settlement Limit for Brooke and more than 1.5km from all of the key services and facilities, on an unlit, 60mph road, with no footways. The site is also identified as being at surface water flood risk and is in the immediate vicinity of Brooke Wood Ancient Woodland/County Wildlife Site. The other issues referred to in this representation go beyond the scope of the VCHAP and do not at this moment in time require an immediate review of the VCHAP as currently prepared.</p>