

Appendix E

Summary of comments received and officer recommendations on the proposed preferred and alternative site consultation.

Dereham

Policy D1 - Preferred Residential Allocation - Land at the Old Maltings, Norwich Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Norfolk County Council (Highways)	Support allocation of the site subject to local highway improvement works being provided.	Support noted.	The site is a key piece of brownfield land in a highly sustainable location in close proximity to Dereham Town Centre. The site provides an opportunity to make best use of brownfield land which limits the need for additional greenfield development and encroachment into the surrounding countryside.
	Mr D. Thompson (Anglia Maltings)	Support inclusion of site for residential development, as it is a brownfield site in a sustainable location. Currently in negotiation with NCC Highways as to the appropriate access points necessary to deliver the site.	Support noted.	
Object	Miss K. Doyle, Mrs S. Knight	Objects due to impact of traffic entering and exiting site.	The implications of local traffic would be considered at the detailed stage through a Transport Assessment. The Council has in place Core Policies seek to protect residential amenity to which development should adhere.	Development offers opportunities for increased walking and cycling and the proposed policy reflects this. As such, it is considered that the site should be allocated for residential development as per the preferred options document.
	Mr and Mrs Doone,	Development will harm local infrastructure	Overall level of development proposed for Dereham is identified in the Core Strategy. Development will be expected to provide any necessary	

			improvements to local infrastructure to enable it to occur.	
	Miss G. Russell	Objects due to impact of development on value of her property and local character and amenity.	The Council has policies in the Core Strategy relating to design and the policy accompanying this allocation also seeks to ensure layout/ design respects existing buildings.	
	Mr and Mrs Doy,	Development will harm local infrastructure, impact on wildlife.	Overall level of development proposed for Dereham is identified in the Core Strategy. Development will be expected to provide any necessary improvements to local infrastructure to enable it to occur.	
	Mr D. Berry	Impact of development on local sewers, highways, social infrastructure, and his residential amenity being harmed by development.	Development will be expected to provide any necessary improvements to local infrastructure to enable it to occur.	
	Mr Humbertston, Mr P Brennan, Mr M. Stevens.	Impact of additional traffic generated by development on Norwich Road/ Greenfields Road.	The Highway Authority (NCC) has not raised any objections to this allocation. However, it is expected that the detailed local traffic implications will be considered through a Transport Assessment accompanying a detailed Planning Application.	
	Mrs B. Fisher	Objects due to wider impact of development on infrastructure in Dereham.	The overall level of growth for Dereham is identified in the adopted Breckland Core Strategy document. It is recognised that individual sites	

			will be required to provide the local infrastructure upgrades necessary (such as transport, education, sewerage etc) and policies in the Core Strategy and the Site Specifics document will ensure that this is delivered as appropriate. However, the evidence to support the Core Strategy indicated that there is either sufficient capacity in wider social infrastructure to accommodate the additional growth or suitable opportunities for enhancement.	
	Mr P. Morton (Dereham Society)	Objects to the scale of development proposed for Dereham	The overall level of growth for Dereham is identified in the adopted Breckland Core Strategy document.	
	Mrs M. Miller	Objects, due to potential harm to the access to her house.	Comment noted. Detailed design would need to have regard to the lawful access afforded to existing residents on site.	
Comment	Dereham Town Council,	Would like to see comprehensive masterplan of the site before it would be granted Planning Permission.	Agree. Proposed policy includes requirement for a masterplan of the whole site.	
	Mayfleet,	New development could harm local sewerage network and increase risk of flooding to their properties.	Proposed policy includes criteria which will ensure development does not harm local sewerage infrastructure.	
	Mrs K. Doyle	Impact of additional traffic on to Norwich Road	Consultation with the Highway Authority (NCC) has not resulted in any objections to the	

			wider allocation of this site. Detailed transport impacts would be assessed through a Transport Assessment at the detailed planning stage.	
	Mr S. Faulkner (Norfolk County Council)	Policy should highlight Listed status of Maltings itself.	Policy and supporting text have been amended to reflect grade II* Listed status of Maltings.	
	Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge (English Heritage)	Allocation of site gives opportunity to secure future of Listed Maltings which is currently in a poor state of repair.	Comments noted. Policy requires masterplan for whole site, but at present there is no identified future use of the Listed buildings nor any indication that a redevelopment is deliverable.	
	Breckland Contaminated Land	Potential contamination could harm viability and deliverability of site.	There is no evidence that currently indicates that development cannot be carried out after suitable remediation has taken place. It is considered that the site is deliverable.	

Policy D2 Preferred Residential Allocation - Land off Greenfields Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Dereham Town Council	Support site for residential development but wish to see scheme give serious consideration to the Dereham Green Infrastructure Study. Would also like to ensure new housing is in-keeping with surrounding developments.	Comments noted. The policy seeks to ensure that development has regard to the findings of the Dereham Green Infrastructure study. Policies in the adopted Breckland Core Strategy deal with issues such as design and amenity which apply to all development.	Despite the significant number of objections received to this site, it is considered that the site should continue to be allocated for residential development as per the preferred options albeit at a slightly reduced number. This is due to the removal of the national indicative minimum density requirement from
	Mr and Mrs Hewson	Support site for development as	Support noted.	

		area is partially developed and highway in place.		national planning policy (PPS3) and removal of erroneous allotment land from the site area.
	Mr M. Haslam	Supports allocation of this site on behalf of his client who is the landowner. Evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development will not result in harm to the local transport network that the objectors believe. Other evidence submitted indicates proposal is deliverable.	Support noted. The supporting transport information supplied by the landowner has been passed to Norfolk County Council Highways for review. NCC has not raised concerns with the adequacy or findings of the transport evidence.	
	Norfolk County Council (Highways)	Support allocation of the site in highway terms subject to local improvement measures, which could include right turn lane into Greenfield Road. There would be a highway benefit by linking Greenfields Road and Wheatcroft Way by providing two points of access.	Support noted. The proposal to link the two roads has arisen from Norfolk County Council standards. It is recognised that further off-site highway improvements may be needed; however, these will be considered at the detailed stage when a greater level of information will be available.	
Object	Mrs B. Warwick, C. M. Dove, E. J and J.C. Catchpole, the Herring Family, Hudswell, Mr and Mrs Ford, Mr and Mrs McGough, Mr and Mrs O'Donnell, Mr and Mrs Price, Mr and Mrs Webb, Mr C. Burgess, Mr C. Mathews, Mr D. Atkins, Mr D. Howes, Mr G. Wolfenden, Mr G. Bridges, Mr J. Conder, Mr J. Livermore, Mr L. Howlett, Mr M. Stevens, Mr O. Howes, Mr S. Cox, Mrs C. Sample, Mrs	Object to the site due to the impact of additional traffic generated on the local highway network, and the potential for 'rat-running' through Greenfields Road/ Wheatcroft Way.	It is recognised that new development will result in the creation of additional traffic. The proposed linking of Greenfields Road and Wheatcroft Way is important as it will provide the two points of access that development of this scale requires. The provision of a link between the two developments will provide for local vehicle	

	<p>Finlay, Mrs Freestone, Mr and Mrs Taylor, Mrs A. Kerr, Mrs J. Hammond, Coventry,</p>		<p>movements onto Norwich Road. The linking of the two developments will not provide a shortcut for road users seeking to bypass Norwich Road on to another destination but will enable existing residents as well as new to benefit from a second access. The link will also improve options for public transport, walking and cycling to from and within this area.</p> <p>A detailed Transport Assessment at the Planning Application stage will also provide an opportunity to seek any further improvements to the local highway network which could include traffic calming.</p>	
	<p>Mr D. Scott, the Herring Family, Miss B. Brennan, Mr D. Howes,</p>	<p>Objects due to adverse impact of development on local wildlife.</p>	<p>It is noted that the site is currently an arable field and has a wider biodiversity value. Development will need to provide open space and as such, this could provide opportunities to promote biodiversity within the required green space. The policy also requires development to have regard to the Dereham Green Infrastructure study.</p>	
	<p>Finlay, Mr and Mrs Doone, Mr and Mrs Drury, Mr and Mrs O'Donnell,</p>	<p>Objects to the scale of development proposed for Dereham.</p>	<p>The scale of development identified for Dereham is set out in the adopted Breckland Core</p>	

			Strategy document and as such the overall scale of growth is not consider further through this document.	
	Master C. Jaques and petition containing 69 signatures. Mr and Mrs Waton and petition of 150 signatures. Mr P. Brennan, Mr R. Jones, Mrs E. Everitt, Mr P. Lovewell.	Objects to allocation of site on landscape, highway and infrastructure grounds.	The comments raised by these objectors have been covered elsewhere in this section.	
	Miss H. Brennan, Mr and Mrs Cowlard, Mr R. Jones,	Object due to impact of development on setting of Listed Dereham Windmill	Comments noted. The policy requires development to have regard to the setting of the Dereham windmill. It is not possible at the site allocation stage to precisely define all components of the scheme as this will be considered that the detailed Planning Application stage.	
	Mr and Mrs Taylor	Objects due to loss of allotments.	Comment noted. The site boundary identified in the document erroneously included an area of allotment land. It is not intended that this form part of any allocation and boundary now amended.	
Comment	Mr S. Faulkner (Norfolk County Council)	Development of site D2 should consider setting of Listed Windmill and the provision of open space as part of the development could limit impact	Comments noted.	

		upon its setting.	
--	--	-------------------	--

Policy D3 – Preferred Residential Allocation - Land to the east of Windmill Avenue

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Norfolk County Council (Highways)	Highway authority support inclusion of the site for residential development subject to local improvements to the footpath/ cycle network.	Support noted.	Despite the significant number of objections received, many of the issues raised have been considered through the development of the Core Strategy or could be resolved through the detailed Planning Application process. As such, it is considered that the site should remain identified for residential development as per the preferred options consultation.
	Mr Mathews (DLP Planning)	Support the identification of the site for residential development. The comments indicate that the site is suitable, available and viable for development and meets national and local criteria and should be allocated.	Support noted.	
Object	A. Fugle, H. Barnard, May, Mr and Mrs Cator, Mr and Mrs Cox, Mr and Mrs Kaszubowski, Mr and Mrs Marjoram, Mr and Mrs Price, Mr Cason, Mr Nobbs, Mrs J. Payton, Mr and Mrs R. Forshaw, T.K. Bussey, V. Frascogna, Mr A. Thomas, Mr P. Morton,	Object to development due to lack of highway, sewerage, and social infrastructure (particularly education, healthcare) in the area.	The wider infrastructure issues raised (particularly in relation to waste water treatment, education, retail provision) were considered as part of the development of the Core Strategy and the Examination in Public of the Council's housing numbers for Dereham. The development will be required to provide any necessary improvements to the local sewerage and highway network and the proposed policy reflects this.	
	A. Koozak, E. Achard, R.L.	Object due to the impact of	The Highway Authority has not	

	Smith,	additional traffic generated by the development on the local highway network.	<p>raised any objection to the identification of this site for residential development, subject to the provision of localised enhancements to the footways and cycle provision.</p> <p>It is considered that the detailed highway matters will be addressed through a Transport Assessment that would be expected as part of a future Planning Application rather than at strategic allocation level.</p>	
	Mr G. Blythe, Mrs S. Chisholm, Mrs U. Mower,	Objects due to harm to residential amenity as a result of overlooking	The adopted Core Strategy contains policy dealing with residential amenity. A;; development will need to have regard to this policy; however, this would be considered through the detailed scheme design at the Planning Application stage.	

	Mr C. Smith (Hopkins Homes)	Objects as site does not have regard to Landscape Character Assessment.	Disagree. All of the reasonable options for housing growth in Dereham are contained within the 'moderate-high' sensitivity landscape character areas in the 1:10,000 settlement fringe assessment. Landscape assessments at this scale cannot be treated as absolute; therefore, the assessment of sites has given regard to surrounding development and features at the site level.	
Comment	Dereham Town Council	Support principle of development subject to avoiding development right to the edge of Shilling Lane. Development should provide landscape buffer to the lane.	Comments noted. The proposed policy seeks to ensure development maximises opportunities to enhance biodiversity corridors of which Shilling Lane is an important component.	

Policy D4 – Preferred Employment Allocation - Land at Rash's Green Industrial Estate

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Dereham Town Council	Support site for industrial development.	Support noted.	It is considered that the site should be identified for industrial development as per the preferred options document. It will be known as D5.
	Norfolk County Council (Highways)	Support the site for industrial development with access provided from Rash's Green.	Support noted.	

Object	Mr M. Robinson (High Scott - Scotts Trust)	Object as they wish the site to be allocated for residential rather than industrial development. Landowner does not consider the site viable for industrial development due to infrastructure costs.	<p>The site is currently saved as an employment allocation in the adopted Core Strategy. The site has been identified as being unsuitable for residential development in previous consultations.</p> <p>No evidence has been presented to indicate that the site is unviable, and the infrastructure requirements to enable development are not unique to this site. Furthermore, there is clear evidence of demand for new industrial development in Dereham as has been demonstrated by the completion of new starter units elsewhere at Rash's Green.</p> <p>It is also important to ensure that there is a reasonable choice of employment sites so that different parts of the employment market are able to expand in the types of location that meet their needs.</p>	
Comment	-	-	-	

Policy D5 – Preferred Employment Allocation - Land to the south of Dereham Business Park

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Norfolk County Council (Highways)	Support inclusion of the site provided an access point is	Support noted.	It is considered that the site (in addition to part of the area

		delivered and improvements are made to pedestrian and cycle links from this area to enhance opportunities for modal shift.		previously identified as D10) be taken forward for employment development as per the preferred options document. It will be considered an alternative allocation and be known as D9.
Object	E. Rushmore, Mr M. Pond, Mr and Mrs Hudson, Mr Crisp,	Objects due to the impact of this development on traffic in the wider Yaxham Road area.	The Highway Authority has not raised any objections to the identification of this site for industrial development. The detailed assessment of traffic movements will be provided as part of a Transport Assessment at the detailed Planning Application stage. Other development in the vicinity (including the Dereham Recycling centre) have already been granted Planning Permission however no further evidence has been presented to indicate that there is a significant adverse cumulative impact of as a result of these proposals.	
	Hudson O'Brien and Lewins Ltd, Mr B. Smith, Mr J. Shorter, Mrs Mortimer,	Objects to the site and consider site D10 should be allocated in preference.	Comments noted.	
	Jones/ Sinclair, Ms K. Halford, Mr and Mrs Lambert, Ms M. Harcourt, Medlar, Miss Siewright, Mr and Mrs Barker, Mr and Mrs Barns, Mr and Mrs Baxter, Mr and Mrs Beckham, Mr and Mrs C. Burton, Mr and Mrs Chilvers, Mr and Mrs	Object to the site as considers it will harm residential amenity through overlooking, noise, and the adverse impact on the local highway network.	The proposed policy contains a number of criteria that seek to protect residential amenity by imposing suitable conditions on development limiting hours of operation, as well as requiring screening and landscaping. The precise form of employment	

	Crockford, Mr and Mrs Fiddy, Mr and Mrs Fletcher, Mr and Mrs Griffi, Mr and Mrs Horsley, Mr and Mrs Lawes, Mr and Mrs Mann, Mr and Mrs Rix, Mr and Mrs Thacker, Mr and Mrs Vaukins, Mr A. Blackpool, Mr and Mrs Pegg, Mr B. Walker, Mr Broster, Mr Bull, Mr D. Baker, Mr G. Sayer, Mr R. Lench, Mr T. Bradley, Mr Walby, Mrs D. Crosby, Mrs E. McGee, Mrs E. Walker, Mrs E. Barrett, Mrs K. Clark, Mrs Lowings, Mrs Morter, Mrs Parkinson, Mrs S. Finn, Mrs Styles, Mrs Webb, Mrs. J. Horseall, P. Lusha, SCD Leslie, Mr and Mrs Rice, Thacker Family, T.J. Mortimer, W. Gilbert, W. Holden, W. Scott,		development is not known and this will determine any potential impacts. The proposed policy required access to be secured via Kingston Road/ Walpole Loke. The Highway authority has not raised any objections to the increase in industrial traffic on Yaxham Road roundabout. However, detailed highway matters would be considered through a Transport Assessment provided as part of a future Planning Application.	
	Mrs Hardy,	Objects and considers land at Rash's Green should be allocated in preference.	The preferred options included land at Rash's Green in addition to the extension of the Dereham Business Park. This is in order to meet the requirements for new employment land that have been set out in the adopted Breckland Core Strategy.	
Comment	-	-	-	

Policy D11 – Preferred Retail Option - Georges Road/ Nunn's Way to Cowper Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				It is considered that the site should remain identified as an
Object	J. Stebbings, Mr T. Wood	Objects and consider that the	There are no current proposals	

	(Dereham Society)	site should be developed for new bus station.	by Norfolk County Council (Local Transport Authority) to locate a bus interchange within the area indicated D11, and this did not form part of the consultation options. No comments were submitted by Norfolk County Council through the consultation indicating that the site should be reserved for a bus interchange at any point during the preparation of the Site Specifics document over the last two years.	area for the intensification of retail development as per the preferred options document. It will be known as D7.
	Mr and Mrs O'Donnell,	Cowper Road car park should remain as a car park and not be redeveloped.	The intensification of retail development in this area presents an opportunity to expand the retail offer of Dereham in a sustainable location within the town centre. The provision of car parking in this area will need to have regard to the parking strategy for Dereham, as well as considering the potential for parking reorganisation within the wider site.	
Comment	Mr S. Faulkner (Norfolk County Council)	Policy should reflect latest terminology contained within PPS5. Policy may also need to be strengthened in light of importance of Conservation Area and heritage assets within	Comments noted.	

		and adjoining the site.		
--	--	-------------------------	--	--

Policy D14 - Preferred Site for a Cemetery - Land east of Dereham Town Football Club

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Adam Ireland (Environment Agency)	Support allocation of site for open space as a cemetery. Request that a risk assessment be provided at Planning Application stage to assess impact on groundwater.	Support noted.	It is recommended that the site continue to be allocated for open space for a cemetery as per the preferred options document. It will be known as D8.
	Mr Mathews (Taylor Wimpey)	Support identification of this piece of land for a cemetery and consider that it is deliverable for this use.	Support noted.	
Object	May	Objects due to loss of agricultural land, and impact of new development on local highway network and local infrastructure capacity.	Disagree with comment. The allocation of this site for a cemetery will result in a low impact on landscape character as there will be very limited built development.	
Comment	Dereham Town Council	Support allocation of site, but request changes to wording to state that ancillary buildings 'will' be acceptable rather than 'may'.	Policy amended to state that ancillary buildings will be acceptable subject to criteria.	
	Mr Cason	Considers that site should be for a crematorium.	Evidence contained in Dereham Cemetery study suggests Crematorium not viable in this location. Dereham TC are the local burial authority and the allocation will meet their future requirements.	

D6 – Alternative Residential Allocation - Land at Garden Centre, Shipdham Road, Toftwood

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mr R. Shrimplin (K. Anema)	Support the identification of the site for residential development on behalf of the landowner Mr K. Anema.	Support noted.	It is recommended that an area including the glasshouses and industrial buildings be identified as a fourth residential development allocation in Dereham for 50 new homes. It will be known as D4.
Object	Dereham Town Council	Consider that the site should be an alternative and not preferred.	Comments noted. The identification of this site for 50 homes on a reduced portion of the site bring in to allocation an additional site to deliver development which will help to ensure the timely delivery of new homes in Dereham. The redevelopment of the glasshouses and structures provides an opportunity to enhance the visual appearance of this area. The site is also considered acceptable in highway terms.	
Comment	Norfolk County Council (Highways)	Do not object to site, but consider that if it were allocated, there may be a need for additional highway measures.	Comments noted. It is expected that any further highway measures would be considered through a Transport Assessment provided as part of a future Planning Application.	
	Breckland Council (Contaminated Land)	Site is within 250m of a potential source of contamination. Recommended that a desk study be required as part of detailed Planning Application.	Comments noted.	

D7 Alternative Residential Allocation – Land at Dumping Green

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Dereham Town Council	Support this as an alternative site.	Comments noted.	It is considered that insufficient justification has been provided to indicate that the site should be brought into allocation as a preferred location for housing development in the pre-submission document. It is also important to reemphasise that whilst NCC Highways have not formally objected to this site, there remain considerable landscape and highway implications that constrain development. Therefore, it is considered that site D7 be removed from the submission document. This will be known as D10.
	Helen Philips on behalf of Gladedale	Document refers to D9.	N/A	
	Mr Chris Smith	Supports the inclusion of this site, however, suggests that this site should feature ahead of site D3. D3 has lesser landscape issues and is the same proximity to local amenities.	Comments noted.	
Object	Mr & Mrs Bowden	Objects due to loss of agricultural land, increased traffic congestion, impact upon access and flooding.	It is noted that the site is currently an arable field and has a wider biodiversity value. Overall level of development proposed for Dereham is identified in the Core Strategy which highlights that Greenfield land will have to be used as there is insufficient amount of Brownfield land remaining inside existing settlement boundaries. Development of this site will be required to provide any necessary improvements to the local sewerage, flooding and highway network.	
	Cllr M Fanthorpe (Ward Member)	If this site were to be developed it should be for industrial use. A preferred site would be land behind Nursery Buildings and	The adopted Core Strategy contains policy dealing with residential amenity and all development will need to have	

		<p>the old CMC Warehouse, off Norwich Road. This site has inadequate access to Dumpling Green or Yaxham Road and would result in congestion. There are highways and flooding implications. It would result in a loss of amenity for nearby residents.</p>	<p>regard to this policy.</p>	
	<p>Mr & Mrs Hewson, Mrs Sandra Howard, Mr Alan Kerrison, Mr & Mrs Adelizzi, Mr & Mrs Alan & Brenda Floyd, Mr & Mrs Steward</p>	<p>Object due to loss of agricultural land, landscape sensitivity, loss of existing hedgerows, impact upon wildlife, habitats, highway implications on to Yaxham Road and implications at the Tesco roundabout and wider infrastructure, issues upon sewerage disposal, drainage and flooding.</p> <p>The site acts as a buffer between urban and rural areas and this development would damage the balance of nature.</p>	<p>It is noted that the site is currently an arable field and has a wider biodiversity value. Overall level of development proposed for Dereham is identified in the Core Strategy which highlights that Greenfield land will have to be used as there is insufficient amount of Brownfield land remain inside of existing settlement boundaries. Development of this site will be required to provide any necessary improvements to the local sewerage, flooding and highway network. Development would be expected to provide any necessary improvements to local infrastructure to enable it to occur.</p>	
	<p>Mr & Mrs Pitt</p>	<p>Object to increase housing numbers in Dereham.</p>	<p>Overall level of development proposed for Dereham is identified in the Core Strategy.</p>	
	<p>Ms Anna Jones</p>	<p>Objects and consider the site be better used for as open</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Malting's site is being taken</p>	

		space. The Malting's in the centre of town would be a preferred site. Concern that development of this site would result in increased number of cars and congestion.	forward within the submission document as a preferred site for future housing growth.	
	Mr Chris Smith	<p>Consider that landscape and access to services and facilities are of a similar nature to that of site D3.</p> <p>It is suggested that as part of a future planning application evidence will demonstrate that the proposed development will not result in harm to the local transport network or landscape sensitivity.</p>	The Preferred options were considered having regard to their impact upon the wider landscape. Site D7 is located within the river valley which is given high protection within Core Policy CP11 of the Adopted Core Strategy. Furthermore, the Highway Authority is suggesting that whilst highway issues are not insurmountable there remain significant constraints to overcome as part of any future planning application. There has been no further evidence put forward that justifies including this site as a preferred option ahead of site D3.	
Comment	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major Constraints to Provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth within the water capacity, waste water capacity and the foul sewerage network.	Comments noted. All development in Dereham is affected by issues surrounding waste water treatment and the sewerage network.	
	Norfolk County Council (Highways)	There is no footway along the frontage although potentially the existing footway to the north could be extended up to	Comments noted. Whilst the Highways Authority in summary is suggesting that issues are not insurmountable there are	

		<p>this site. There is sufficient site frontage to provide an adequate access point onto Yaxham Road. There are concerns about the suitability of Dumpling Green to cater for any increase in vehicular movements due to its poor condition, inadequate width in places and its poor alignment, however if Dumpling Green were to be suitably improved this could be considered as an additional access point to the site. Due to the large size of the potential development, the 30 mph speed limit may need to be relocated to cover the site access and improvement works may be needed to provide traffic calming measures such as a roundabout or right turn lane to prevent conflict with other road users. There is also concern over significant additional vehicular use of Westfield Lane resulting from development of this site due to its inadequate width and poor alignment at the railway bridge and some investigation into possible mitigation measures should be carried out. This site is within reasonable walking distance of supermarkets, a school and an employment</p>	<p>significant constraints to overcome as part of any future planning application.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		area but relatively remote from the town centre. There are no highway reasons why this site can not be included within the plan.		
--	--	--	--	--

D8 – Alternative Residential Allocation - Land at Hoe Road (Northall Green)

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Dereham Town Council	Councillors suggested that this should be an alternative site and not the main site.	This site was consulted on as an alternative and not a preferred option.	It is considered that alternative option D8 should be removed from the list of alternative options as a result of highways objection. It is therefore considered an unreasonable site.
Object	NCC Highways	The Highway Authority supports the exclusion of this alternative site from the plan. The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan.	Objection noted. Site proposed to be removed as an unreasonable option for development.	
Comment	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth within the waste water capacity and the foul sewerage network and upgrades required to waster capacity.	Anglian Water is aware of constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered there are no insurmountable constraints.	

D9 –Alternative Residential Allocation - Land at Swanton Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Dereham Town Council	Councillors suggested that this should be an alternative site and not the main site.	Comments noted. The site was consulted on as an alternative and not a preferred option.	It is considered that alternative option D9 should be removed as an alternative option due to highways objection. It is considered the site is an unreasonable site.
Object	Norfolk County Council (Highways)	The Highway Authority supports the exclusion of this alternative site from the plan.	Objection noted.	

		The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan.		
Comment	Kathryn Money on behalf of Gladedale	Supports allocation of this site on behalf of the client who is the landowner. Evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development will not result in harm to the local transport network. Other evidence submitted indicates proposal is deliverable.	Notwithstanding information raised, the Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan.	
	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth within the waste water capacity and the foul sewerage network.	Anglian Water is aware of constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered there are no insurmountable constraints.	

D10 – Alternative Employment Allocation - Land east of Dereham Business Park

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Hudson, O'Brien & Lewins on behalf of Mr Philip Summers	Object to the allocation of site D5 ahead of site D10 and instead propose the allocation of site D10 for employment uses with site D5 that then being identified as an alternative allocation. Provides justification why site D10 is preferred over site D5.	Comments noted. The assessment provided in respect of landscape impact of site D10 versus D5 is finely balanced. It is notable that the agent acknowledges that both sites are suitable for employment use and the issues mainly centre on the phasing of development.	The phasing of development of future employment expansion at Dereham business park is finely balanced. It is recommended that site D10 should be introduced as the preferred allocation. However, Members should be mindful that the identification of site D5 as a contingency site recognises the wider acceptability of this site for
	Mr Ben Walker	No reason given.	Support noted.	
	Mr M. Robinson (On behalf of The Trustees of GR Scott)	Supports this as a logical place.	Support noted.	

	Summers Wykes-Sneyd	D10 would be more suitable the D5 for employment allocation. D10 would have less impact upon local amenity. Have provided additional evidence in the form of an ecological assessment.	Comments noted.	employment development. This will be known as D6
	TJ Mortimer	D10 would be more suitable the D5 for employment allocation. D10 would have less impact upon local amenity.	Comments noted. Both sites will have a degree of landscape impact; however, the accompanying policy seeks to ensure that appropriate landscaping is provided to minimise impact of development.	
	Mrs Elaine Walker	Support paragraph 2.54.	Comment noted.	
Object	-	-	-	
Comment	Mrs Sue Bull	Major Constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth to waste water and foul sewerage network.	Anglian Water is aware of constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered there are no insurmountable constraints.	
	Highways Authority	There are no highway reasons why this site can not be included within the plan.	Comments noted.	

D12 – Alternative Retail Allocation - Edge of Centre Sites

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	-	-	-	It is considered that alternative option D12 not be pursued further as a result of lack of support and highway objection. It is therefore considered an
Object	-	-	-	
Comment	Norfolk County Council (Highways)	The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan.	Comments noted.	

				unreasonable site.
--	--	--	--	--------------------

D13 – Alternative Retail Allocation - Georges Road/ Nunn’s Way to Cowper Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	-	-	-	Whilst Highways have not objected to this site, no evidence has been presented for the need for additional office and leisure within Dereham that that requires an allocation. It is recommended that this alternative option will not be taken forward to the submission document. This site will be known as D11.
Object	-	-	-	
Comment	Norfolk County Council (Highways)	There are no highway reasons why this site can not be included within the plan.	Comments noted.	

D15 – Alternative option for new open space for cemetery

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	-	-	-	It is considered that the site is not taken forward for open space as a cemetery. This will be known as D12.
Object	-	-	-	
Comment	Norfolk County Council (Highways)	Would not object if the site was to be included in the LDF for a cemetery.	Comments noted. Cemetery is not the preferred land use for this area of land and as such is not recommended to be taken further.	

Unreasonable Sites

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	-	-	-	Notwithstanding concerns with the represented sites, they were submitted at a late stage in the process. Due to the loss of open
Object	Dick Wingate on behalf of Dereham Golf Club	Wishes to see land at Dereham Golf Club included in the boundary.	In respect of Mr Wingate’s site, this has not previously been consulted on at	

			previous stages in the process and as such should not be considered at this late stage. Furthermore, development of this parcel of land would result in the loss of Open Space protected under Policy DC11 of the Adopted Core Strategy. There may well be access and highway issues as part of any future development and the site and any development may impact upon the Dereham Conservation Area.	space the site is not considered to be taken forward.
Comment	-	-	-	

Swaffham

Introduction

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				A number of detailed points have been raised on the introductory section for Swaffham which relate to the evidence base for the town. This evidence base was prepared for the Core Strategy and has been found to be sound. The Site Specifics document needs to be in conformity with the Core Strategy document. Therefore it is recommended that no changes are
Object	Mr Adam Case	Objects to paragraph 2.62 as the industrial site at Redland Tiles was originally rejected by Swaffham Council but overruled by the Thetford Councillors when being put forward for change of use to residential.	The Council's Employment Land Review was undertaken in 2006 by independent consultants (Roger Tym & Partners) who concluded that the former Redland Tiles site was unattractive to the employment market due to its distance from the A47	

			and the cost of remediation. The site now has planning permission for residential.	required to the factual introductory section for Swaffham.
	Mr Adam Case	Objects to paragraph 2.65 in regards to the assessment made within the Breckland Landscape Settlement Fringe which states there is limited potential for expansion to the west of town, however the area to the west of the town is closer to the town centre than the proposed allocation at SW1 and therefore appears contradictory.	The Council's Landscape Character Assessment – Settlement Fringe Study is an independent piece of work based on site visits and historical analysis. The landscape to the south-west of Swaffham is part of the distinctive Brecks landscape and judged to be more inherently and highly sensitive to new development. The proposed allocation at site SW1 is in landscape defined as tributary farmland and as such is assessed to be a more enclosed landscape which is moderately sensitive. The findings of the Landscape Character Assessment work have been reported to and accepted by Breckland Council.	
	Mr Adam Case	Objects to paragraph 2.67. Stone Curlew restriction area and sites have been identified as having to avoid these areas. SW1 is a preferred location by the	The Stone Curlew protection buffer was established though the Council's Core Strategy document and includes land close to the south and west	

		Council however, this is closer to the Stone Curlews restriction areas than many of the other sites and therefore again is contradictory.	to Swaffham given the proximity of suitable protected habitat capable of hosting Stone Curlew nests. Site SW1 is not in this buffer and is shielded from the buffer by existing development.	
Comment	Highways Agency	Raise no objection to the preferred or alternative sites on the highways network in Swaffham.	Comments noted.	

Policy SW1 - Preferred Residential Allocation - Land to the East of Brandon Road and North of the Former Redland Tiles Site

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	DPP Ltd on behalf of Gladedale Anglia Ltd	The preferred allocation of land for housing at Policy SW1 is sensible and appropriate having regard to its relationship with the former Redland Tiles' site to its south. The allocation would ensure a sustainable link between the Redland site and the town centre and creating a stronger settlement boundary to the south east of Swaffham. To achieve the form of sustainable development appropriate here, we would suggest a number of benefits to delivery in linking the two sites. These	The overall support for site SW1 is noted. The respondent raises some detailed issues about the inclusive delivery of infrastructure and facilities in south-east Swaffham as a result of the proposed allocation at SW1 and the extant permission for 414 dwellings to the south of SW1. The policy for SW1 identifies all the known on-site infrastructure requirements arising from the development of the site. Additionally, a masterplan is required prior to the submission of any	No change. Retain site SW1 as the proposed allocation for 250 homes in Swaffham. Whilst competing sites have objected to its proposed allocation, it should be noted that there is local support for the site and fundamentally no objection from the local Transport Authority to its identification as a proposed allocation.

		<p>include: (1) Highway Improvements - Safe highway access to the site from Brandon Road, one of the principal routes into Swaffham, is important to the effective delivery of both sites, such that opportunities/shared needs for the sites (such as access) should be considered. (2) A coordinated approach to the delivery of a general package of transport improvements (enhanced bus services and pedestrian/cycle links) and (3) supporting Infrastructure – including a holistic assessment of retail needs, community and leisure facilities etc to adequately meet the needs of this new community. Our client considers that opportunity exists for a new local centre (at the very least) on the former Redland Tiles' site providing for shopping and community needs which would fulfil a number of these requirements for that scheme. We consider our client's site better placed to support such infrastructure</p>	<p>application. The masterplanning process will include addressing the detailed linkages to adjoining areas and the precise form and location of any on-site community infrastructure. In principle, shared provision across a wider development of 664 dwellings is to be encouraged and any provision will need to be in accordance with the policies in the adopted Core Strategy document.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		principally due to its size, proposed highway access (roundabout junction) and linkages, and deliverability in the shorter term. It is acknowledged in your consultation (Paragraph 2.74) that the proposed allocation will critically need to consider provision for the delivery of key infrastructure and services as part of its phasing. The opportunity for coalescence between the sites should therefore be to the forefront.		
	J B Clements, Marian Clements on behalf of Swaffham and District Swimming Pool Association, L Woods, Mr & Mrs Bishop, Mr Trevor Greef, Mr Thair	This site is supported for residential development as it is close to local infrastructure. Development of this site may reduce town centre traffic congestion. The proximity to Hammonds High School makes it the ideal choice for adoption in the LDF.	Support noted.	
	Mr John Wallace	Support this site and encourage low density development.	Support noted.	
	Mr Reuben Linehan	Support the development of this site and the principles as illustrated within the policy.	Support noted.	

	NCC Highways	Subject to local improvement works the Highway Authority supports the inclusion of this preferred site in the plan.	Support noted.	
	Richard Sykes-Popham on behalf of Abel Homes	Evidence submitted on behalf of the site owner / promoter Abel Homes that the site is available and deliverable and can provide the required infrastructure and community benefits. The material submitted affirms that the site is not affected by the Stone Curlew protection area and the sustainability issues raised by opposing site promoters are selective. The advantages of proximity to the schools is highlighted and the material contains evidence that the developer has been working on bringing the site forward (to demonstrate delivery) including a waste water solution with Anglian Water.	Support noted.	
Object	Taylor Wimpey Developments Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Developments Ltd objects to the principle of the preferred allocation (Site SW1) and provide justification as to what	The rationale for selecting site SW.1 as the proposed allocation for Swaffham is robust and sustainable. The site is acceptable in landscape and access	

		<p>SW11 more preferable. Site SW.1 is located 1.5km from the town centre of Swaffham and more than 2km from the Turbine Way / Castle Acre employment area at the northern end of the town, the development of 664 new homes (including the extant permission for 414 homes to the south of the site) will result in a significant spatial imbalance and polarisation of uses within Swaffham, with the primary employment area lying over 2km from what would be the largest residential area in the town. Taken as a whole, the provision of 664 homes in a location without adequate local social and economic infrastructure could have a major impact on the sustainability of Swaffham as a whole. Whilst the site does present an option that will have a low visual, physical and environmental impact on the surrounding environment. Policy SW1 is both unjustified and inconsistent with national planning policy, it should</p>	<p>terms and has the same, if not better, ability to access the waste water network as compared to other sites to the east of Swaffham. Whilst the site is very close to the junior and high schools it is noted that the site is some distance from the town centre and employment areas. However, given the linear form of the town and the landscape sensitivities of going east or west of the town centre, all sites will be located some distance from one key service or facility. To mitigate against this policy SW1 includes footpath/cycle enhancements and bus facilities to utilise the internal bus service in Swaffham. Whilst the fact that 664 homes would be provided to the south is not contested, 414 of those homes already have planning permission and site SW1 provides an ability to link those permitted homes to the town centre, including off-road cycle and footpaths. There is a recorded level of public</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

		therefore not be allocated for housing development and the proposed quantum of housing for Swaffham should be directed to Norwich Road (SW11). Taylor Wimpey's site at Norwich Road (SW11) adjoins the present built up area of the town and it is in a sustainable location to provide housing development to meet the future housing needs of Swaffham.	support for the site and no local opposition in the LDF process. The highways authority has not objected to its proposed allocation unlike other sites where the transport sustainability is poor. Therefore it is not proposed to remove site SW1. Concerns with site SW11 are addressed below.
	Adam Case	Stone Curlew restriction area and sites have been identified as having to avoid these areas. SW1 is a preferred location by the Council however, this is closer to the Stone Curlews restriction areas than many of the other sites and therefore again is contradictory.	Site SW1 is not in the Stone Curlew protection buffer. Furthermore the site is shielded from a direct line to those areas capable for hosting nesting Stone Curlews by existing residential development. There is no objection from either Natural England or RSPB to the proposed allocation and the Council's own Habitats Regulation Assessment work has not identified Stone Curlews as a reason for not including site SW1.
Comment	BDC Contaminated Land	Potential contaminative source or within 250m adjacent	Comments noted. Contaminated land assessment would be

		commercial/industrial site Contaminated land assessment required before planning permission is granted – desk study initially because of the size of development.	undertaken at planning application stage.	
	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth in Swaffham are recognised with regards to waste water capacity. Upgrades are required to the foul sewerage network and water supply network to deliver the Core Strategy level of growth.	The comments from Anglian Water are noted. The constraints and required upgrades to enable future growth within this part of Swaffham are considered to be achievable for site SW1 given the proximity of the sewage treatment works and the location of the existing strategic sewer network in relation to the site.	

Policy SW2 - Preferred Employment Allocation - Land to the North of the Ecotech Centre

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Savills on behalf of Lands Improvement (c/o agent)	The allocation of SW2 is fully supported.	Support noted.	No change to the allocation at SW.2 However, emphasise in the policy that the site will only be released once detailed permissions are achieved on the remaining undeveloped areas of the adjoining Ecotech Park.
Object	D Cannon	Vacant plots on Ecotech Park should be used first prior to allocation of more employment land being developed. This land could be rented to the gypsy and traveller community.	Point 3 of the policy relating to site SW2 states that development will not commence until vacant and developable land on the existing Ecotech Centre has the benefit of detailed planning permission. It is agreed that the focus of	

			<p>effort should be on delivering remaining employment land on Ecotech before releasing additional land. However, once detailed permissions have been granted it may be necessary to release site SW2 to secure economic investment in the town. It is not in this Sites document to release additional land for Gypsy and Traveller provision. The A11 corridor has been identified as the strategic location for a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site and this is being addressed through other Development Plan Documents, namely the Attleborough & Snetterton Heath Area Action Plan.</p>	
Comment	NCC Highways	Subject to a satisfactory access being provided through the Eco Tech Employment Area, the Highway Authority supports the inclusion of this preferred site in the plan.	Comments noted	
	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth with regards to waste water	Anglian Water is aware of constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered there are no	

		capacity upgrades are required to the foul sewerage network.	insurmountable constraints.	
--	--	--	-----------------------------	--

Policy SW3 - Preferred Employment Allocation - Land to the West of the Eco-Tech Employment Area

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				No change. Retain SW3 as an employment land allocation in the proposed submission document.
Object				
Comment	NCC Highways	Subject to a satisfactory access being provided through the Eco Tech Employment Area, the Highway Authority supports the inclusion of this preferred site in the plan.	Comments noted	
	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth with regards to waste water capacity upgrades are required to the foul sewerage network.	Anglian Water is aware of constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered there are no insurmountable constraints.	

SW4: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the West of Brandon Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				It is considered that alternative option SW4 should be removed from the list of alternative options as a result of highway and RSPB objections. It is therefore recommended to present SW4 as an unreasonable site in the
Object	NCC Highways	The Highway Authority supports the exclusion of this alternative site from the plan. The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the	Comments noted.	

		plan.		proposed submission document.
	Mike Jones RSPB	Parts of alternative site SW4 is located within 400m of those parts of the Brecks SPA suitable for Woodlark and Nightjar populations. The 400m buffer is a means of restricting impacts on ground nesting species such as the Nightjar and Woodlark from urban effects such as cat predation. The RSPB would consider it unlikely that development within this 400m buffer would be able to pass a project-level Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) and therefore this location should not be put forward.	Comments noted. The site was presented as a reasonable alternative and the issue of proximity to the forest parts of the Brecks SPA were identified. The consultation process has clearly identified concerns about the impact on Woodlark and Nightjars and Officers agree that with the availability of alternative sites it is highly unlikely that including SW4 as an allocation would enable the document to pass Habitats Regulation Assessment and as such the document would be found unsound.	
Comment	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth with regards to waste water capacity upgrades are required to the foul sewerage network.	Anglian Water is aware of constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered there are no insurmountable constraints.	

SW5: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the South East of Cley Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				It is considered that alternative option SW5 should be removed
Object	NCC Highways	The Highway Authority		

		supports the exclusion of this alternative site from the plan. The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan.		from the list of alternative options as a result of highway objection. It is therefore considered an unreasonable site to present in the proposed submission document.
Comment	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth with regards to waste water capacity upgrades are required to the foul sewerage network.	Anglian Water is aware of constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered there are no insurmountable constraints.	

SW6: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the North of Beachamwell Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				
Object	Mr Adam Case	Under the last paragraph of SW6 it states there is a gas pipeline, this is a fuel line which goes through the centre of the site however this fuel line goes under houses in Mill Farm Nurseries and therefore again is contradictory.	Mill Farm Nurseries was built in the 1960s/1970s at a time of different standards. Whilst the route of gas pipelines could be accommodated within developments (ie as open space) the issue is identified as part of a cumulative picture of issues which indicate that development of SW6 will not be straightforward. These delivery issues work against the identification of this site for development	It is considered that alternative option SW6 should be removed from the list of alternative options as a result of highway objection. It is therefore considered an unreasonable site.

			when other sites do not have so many complex hurdles to address.	
	NCC Highways	The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan.	Comments noted.	
Comment	Environmental Protection, Breckland Council	Our records indicate a portion of this site to the east overlaps a potentially filled quarry. Planning permission would be dependent on the developer providing a site investigation with sufficient quantitative evidence to show that there is a viable remediation method for residential development of this area. Therefore this may affect the timely delivery and viability of the site.	Comments noted.	
	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth to the west of Swaffham with regards to waste water capacity. Upgrades are required to the foul sewerage network and water supply network.	The comments from Anglian Water are noted. The constraints and required upgrades to enable future growth within this part of Swaffham are considered to be insurmountable in the context of the scale of growth identified for the town (250 homes).	

SW7: Alternative Residential Site - Land to the South of Lynn Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				
Object	Mrs Julie Jaques on behalf of owners MGPD Ltd	Objects to paragraphs 2.101 in that development would not detract from the character and appearance of the Brecks landscape.	The assessment of sites (097) 028 and (097) 031 concluded they be identified as an alternative site SW7 because of landscape impact and waste water. In respect of Site (097) 031 further concerns related to access and loss of open space (allotment land). It is recognised that the allotment land protection no longer applies. However access to the site can only be achieved in isolation from Whitsands Road which is unacceptable. On this basis Breckland presented the site as part of the wider SW7 so access could be secured from the Lynn Road. Further detailed evidence on water infrastructure highlights that developing land to the west of Swaffham including SW7 will require strategic upgrades to the waste water network which the proposed scale of	No change to the proposed submission document and site SW7 be retained as a reasonable alternative site. Whilst there are no highways constraints to the development of SW7 in its totality or local opposition, it is recommended that the sensitivity of the landscape in conjunction with the need to bring in significant waste water upgrades across the town mean that this site should remain a reasonable alternative and not the preferred site. This will be known as SW4.
	Mrs Julie Jaques on behalf of owners MGPD Ltd	Considers that sewerage arrangements can be addressed to enable this site to come forward.		
	Mrs Julie Jaques on behalf of owners MGPD Ltd	Development of this part of the former allotments site in the manner outlined would not affect the gas pipeline to the west of the proposed development area.		
	Mrs Julie Jaques on behalf of owners MGPD Ltd	The document should be amended to include site (097) 031 which is no longer statutorily protected allotment land.		
Comment	Mr Dick Wingate	Objects to this site being a alternative allocation. Sites [097]028 and [097]031 have previously been represented to the Local Authority.		

			development for the town cannot deliver on its own. Furthermore, no evidence has been presented as part of preferred sites consultation which demonstrates that Breckland Council's landscape assessment that this is sensitive Brecks landscape is flawed.
	NCC Highways	Subject to local improvements there are no highway reasons why site SW7 can not be included within the plan.	Comments noted.
	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth to the west of Swaffham with regards to waste water capacity. Upgrades are required to the foul sewerage network and water supply network.	The comments from Anglian Water are noted. The constraints and required upgrades to enable future growth within this part of Swaffham are considered to be insurmountable in the context of the scale of growth identified for the town (250 homes).

SW8: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the west of Cley Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				No change to the proposed submission document and site SW8 be retained as a reasonable alternative site. Whilst there are no highways constraints or local
Object	Mr Adam Case	It is suggested that issues regarding landscape, sewer network gas, and electricity can be resolved and or	Further detailed evidence on water infrastructure highlights that developing land to the west of	

		mitigated against. Open space and low cost housing will be provided on site.	Swaffham including SW8 will require strategic upgrades to the waste water network which the proposed scale of development for the town cannot deliver on its own. Furthermore, no evidence has been presented as part of preferred sites consultation which demonstrates that Breckland Council's landscape assessment that this is sensitive Brecks landscape is flawed.	opposition to site SW8, it is recommended that the sensitivity of the landscape in conjunction with the need to bring in significant waste water upgrades across the town mean that this site should remain a reasonable alternative and not the preferred site. This will be known as SW5.
Comment	NCC Highways	Subject to local improvements there are no highway reasons why this site can not be included within the plan.	Comments noted.	
	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth to the west of Swaffham with regards to waste water capacity. Upgrades are required to the foul sewerage network and water supply network.	The comments from Anglian Water are noted. The constraints and required upgrades to enable future growth within this part of Swaffham are considered to be insurmountable in the context of the scale of growth identified for the town (250 homes).	

SW9: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the East of New Sporle Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
----------	-------------	---------------------	------------------	------------------------

Support	Mr Paul Took on behalf of Mr & Mrs Hall	It is considered that the development of land, denoted as site 097/010 (a 3.14ha component part of Site SW9) in the LDF process, to be both accessible and sustainable. In addition a development of 100 dwellings on the site is in our opinion able to be accommodated without the need to improve the alignment of New Sporle Road on the approach to the junction with the A1065. Furthermore the site is reasonably related to the town centre and within reasonable cycling distance to the schools.	The site was considered as part of the preferred options consultation and Swaffham Town Council was supportive that site SW9 was presented as one of the preferred sites. However, highways concerns over accessing the site have been known for some time and the consultation was an opportunity to test whether there was an alternative way of delivering the site. The Highways Authorities have maintained their objection to the site including concerns about its distance from the Primary and High Schools.	Notwithstanding the additional information submitted on behalf of Mr Hall in support for this site, objections have been raised by both the Highways Authority the Highways Agency which preclude development of this site unless evidence is produced to overcome these issues. Further constraints are attributed to site SW9 due to it being in multiple ownerships, environmental concerns from the A47 traffic levels and lack of proximity to town centre and local schools. For these reasons it is recommended that the site be identified as an unreasonable option on highways grounds rather than a reasonable alternative.
Object	NCC Highways	The site is in a remote location from the town centre and is a good distance from the schools in Swaffham. There is, accordingly, a strong likelihood that everyday journeys would be made by car. There are also concerns relating to the suitability of New Sporle Road for significant additional vehicular use, this being due its junction arrangement with the	Comments noted.	

		A1065. Summary: The Highway Authority supports the exclusion of this alternative site from the plan. The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan.		
Comment	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth with regards to waste water capacity apply to Swaffham and have influenced the scale of growth. Whilst there is some limited network capacity on the east side of the town, upgrades are required to the foul sewerage network to accommodate site SW9.	The constraints to the waste water network are noted. The upgrades required are considered achievable in the context of the level of development proposed.	
	Highways Agency	Alternative site SW9 is located immediately adjacent to the A47(T). Environmental considerations, such as noise and air quality, may preclude residential land use on this site.		

SW10: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the North of Norwich Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				A number of technical comments

Object				have been received on this site which reaffirms the evidence Breckland Council was in receipt of before the consultation. Therefore no new evidence has come forward which would result in a reassessment of the site to include it as a final allocation in the proposed submission document. It is recommended to retain the site as a reasonable alternative. This will be known as SW6.
Comment	BDC Contaminated Land	Potential contaminative source within 250m of the site. Therefore a contaminated land assessment is required before planning permission is granted.	Comments noted. Contaminated land assessment would be undertaken at planning application stage.	
	NCC Highways	Subject to local improvements there are no highway reasons why this site can not be included within the plan.	Comments noted.	
	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth with regards to waste water capacity apply to Swaffham and have influenced the scale of growth. Whilst there is some limited network capacity on the east side of the town, upgrades are required to the foul sewerage network to accommodate site SW10.	The constraints to the waste water network are noted. The upgrades required are considered achievable in the context of the level of development proposed.	

SW11: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the South of Norwich Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Taylor Wimpey Developments Ltd	It is considered that SW11 is a more sustainable site than the preferred site as	Site SW11 has been presented as a reasonable alternative because of	No change. The reasons why this site was identified as a reasonable alternative remain valid as they are

		<p>SW1 due to its close proximity the town centre, main areas of employment within the town and local services, amenities and school etc. PPS3 policy has been applied to illustrate its deliverability, availability and suitability. The site is neither subject of, nor adjacent to, any areas of ecological sensitivity. Taylor-Wimpey disagree with the assessment in the consultation document and the impact of the site upon Listed Buildings.</p>	<p>landscape impact and proximity of Grade II listed buildings at Wood Farm. Views are afforded across the site from Norwich Road and across the site from the public footpath. Similar landscape and proximity to Listed Building issues due not apply in relation to the proposed allocation at SW1. The site is well-related to the town centre and the infant school however it is equidistant by some 900 metres from both the main employment sites and main school areas. The relative locational advantages of the site are not considered sufficient to outweigh the site specific impacts of the site on the local landscape and adjoining listed building.</p>	<p>inherently linked to the local landscape and the relationship of the site to the Listed Building. It is not to say that the site cannot be developed (as evidenced from the material submitted) and nor is its location so poor in wider sustainability terms in relation to proximity to town centre that its location is unreasonable. However, on balance, the local environmental issues affecting this site are such that they make the site a reasonable alternative rather than part of the proposed allocation for Swaffham. This will be known as SW7.</p>
Object				
Comment	BDC Contaminated Land	<p>Potential contaminative source within 250m of the site. Therefore a contaminated land assessment is required before planning permission is granted – desk study initially because of the size of development.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Contaminated land assessment would be undertaken at planning application stage.</p>	

	NCC Highways	Subject to local improvements there are no highway reasons why this site can not be included within the plan.	Comments noted.	
	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth with regards to waste water capacity apply to Swaffham and have influenced the scale of growth. Whilst there is some limited network capacity on the east side of the town, upgrades are required to the foul sewerage network to accommodate site SW10.	The constraints to the waste water network are noted. The upgrades required are considered achievable in the context of the level of development proposed.	

SW12: Alternative Residential Allocation -Land to the south of North Pickenham Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				No change. Recommend retain site SW.12 as a reasonable alternative site rather than a proposed allocation for submission. This will be known as SW.8.
Object	Mr Adam Case	The site has previously been allocated for residential development in former Local Plan documents. The site has good access and has good proximity to local amenities and facilities. The site has new upgraded gas, water and electricity and meets	The site is located at a gateway entrance to the site to the town approaching from North Pickenham in a location which has a relatively rural character. The rural character is accentuated by the proximity of listed farm buildings and the historic	

		the criteria that the preferred site chosen at SW1 does not meet. Suggests that impacts upon the listed building can be mitigated by sympathetic landscaping on the eastern boundary.	Dulgate Lane to the south of the town. Whilst the site is reasonably close to the town centre it has a generally poor relationship to the town with limited ability to provide links other than via North Pickenham Road and White Cross Road.	
Comment	BDC Contaminated Land	Potential contaminative source within 250m. Contaminated land assessment required before planning permission is granted – desk study initially because of the size of development.	Comments noted. Contaminated land assessment would be undertaken at planning application stage.	
	NCC Highways	Subject to local improvements there are no highway reasons why this site can not be included within the plan.	Comments noted.	
	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth with regards to waste water capacity apply to Swaffham and have influenced the scale of growth. Whilst there is some limited network capacity on the east side of the town, upgrades are required to	The constraints to the waste water network are noted. The upgrades required are considered achievable in the context of the level of development proposed.	

		the foul sewerage network to accommodate site SW12.		
--	--	---	--	--

SW13: Alternative Employment Allocation - Land to the North of the A47

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				It is considered that alternative option SW13 should be removed from the list of alternative options as a result of highway objection. It is therefore considered an unreasonable site.
Object	NCC Highways	The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan.	Comments noted.	
Comment	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth with regards to waste water capacity apply to Swaffham and have influenced the scale of growth. Whilst there is some limited network capacity on the east side of the town, upgrades are required to the foul sewerage network to accommodate site SW13.	The constraints to the waste water network are noted. It is not understood whether the upgrades required are considered achievable in the context of the level of development proposed at SW13.	

Unreasonable Sites

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				No change. Sites (097) 006 and (097) 022 should remain as unreasonable options.
Object	Dick Wingate on behalf of Heygate Farms Ltd	Land at The Manor, Norwich Road (sites [097] 006 & 022) are capable of accommodating low	Sites [097] 006 & 022 have been previously scoped through 2008 and 2009 issues and options and	

		<p>density, high quality designed dwellings which would make an entirely appropriate entrance to the town on the north side of the Norwich Road. Sites are currently only being promoted by the Council for maximum density development, with no allowance for low density forms of development. The Government has recently relaxed the requirement for maximum densities. Services are available, and the site is in a completely sustainable location, being within walking distance from the town centre.</p>	<p>were agreed by Breckland Council as being unreasonable for development due to their impact on Grade II Listed Buildings and discounted. The Norwich Road approach into Swaffham is characterised by an undeveloped quality particularly the Antinghams and land around the Manor House. This area provides a setting for the Church, the historical Campingland and the Manor. Development, irrespective of density, will encroach into this open area and harm the character of this locally valued and historically importance undeveloped area. Officers are still of the view that low density development will adversely affect the setting of the Listed Buildings in this area.</p>	
Comment				

Watton

Introduction

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				Comments noted.
Object				
Comment	Highways Agency.	Raise no objection to the preferred or alternative sites on the strategic road network in Watton.	Comments noted.	
	Mrs Helen Hornagold, Mr Bryan Wykes.	<p>Wishes to see more power to local people as a result of the Government agenda.</p> <p>Concern existing unfinished residential developments.</p> <p>The town needs more green open spaces.</p>	<p>The Adopted Core Strategy has determined the districts growth agenda. Local level consultation remains unchanged through the planning process.</p> <p>Open Space Policy DC11 within the Adopted Core Strategy deals with the protection of existing areas of open space and contributions to open space provision from all new development.</p>	Comments noted.
	Bryan Wykes, John Potter.	<p>Concern over sewage in the Langmere road Swaffham Road, Brandon road and Saham Road area and flooding at Town Green.</p> <p>Surface water drainage needs updating in Nelson Court, Sharman Avenue, Goffe Close, Tom Milford Place and Brandon</p>	<p>Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town. It is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints.</p>	Comments noted.

		Road. Increased development will exacerbate this problem.		
--	--	---	--	--

Policy W1 - Preferred Residential Allocation - Land to west of A1075 and adjacent Wayland High School

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mrs J Seal (Watton Town Council).	Support for W1 providing that the piece of land for the provision of cycle/footway is located to the north of the site to benefit the school.	This is emphasised in point 6 of policy W1.	It is considered that despite the representations received that the preferred site W1 remains appropriate.
	Mr Stephen Faulkner (NCC).	Supports the expansion and enhancement of the school. The Policy ought to indicate that the northern part of the site should be safeguarded for education uses and should with the rest of the school lie within the settlement boundary of the town.	Detailed design principles would be established at planning applications stage.	
	Transport Planner (NCC).	Highway Authority supports the inclusion of this preferred site in the plan, subject to a satisfactory access being provided and additional recommendations.	Comments noted.	
Object	Mr Chris Smith.	Considers this site to be unsustainable. Site 104 [032] is preferable.	Site 104 [032] has been previously scoped through 2008 and 2009 issues and options and has been discounted.	
	Norman Phillips (Spokesperson Churchill Close Residents Association).	Concern relating to approved planning application 3PL/2002/0134, 3PL/2010/0474/F and 3PL/2010/0474.	This comment relates to approved planning applications rather than a specific site. NCC Highways have raised no	

		<p>Concerns over highways constraints from Churchill Close.</p> <p>Concerns with regards to the lack of school facilities as a result of additional housing numbers.</p> <p>Concern over sewer capacity in this area.</p>	<p>objection to this preferred site. Point 5 within Policy W1 refers to school expansion and enhancement provision on this site.</p> <p>Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints.</p>	
	Richard Denempont.	<p>Concern due to erosion of the landscape, density of proposed development and reference to previous refusal and subsequent appeals on site.</p>	<p>Density is in accordance with government guidance and Breckland's Adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Previous applications and subsequent refusals/appeals were dealt with in accordance with the Breckland 1999 Local Plan as the site is located outside of the settlement boundary. There is not enough capacity within the Watton settlement boundary to accommodate proposed housing numbers therefore will result in the use of Greenfield land.</p>	
Comment	Sue Bull (Anglian Water).	<p>Major constraints to provision of infrastructure or treatment for growth in terms of foul sewerage network capacity.</p>	<p>Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered there are no</p>	

			insurmountable constraints.	
--	--	--	-----------------------------	--

Policy W2a - Preferred Residential Allocation - Land to south of Norwich Road – Former RAF Officers Mess

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Bennett Plc on behalf of Gerald Eve LLP	Support the preferred option for W2a but are concerned that the limited number of dwellings proposed (Policy W2a 30 dwellings on 2.25 hectares at a density of 13.33 dph represents a missed opportunity to provide more homes on land which has mainly been previously developed.	National Guidance has recently removed the requirement for minimum density and allows for local level determination and flexibility. Density has been amended to provide 22 dwellings on this site as opposed to 30 to take in to account the surrounding environment and local concern (policy refers to gross no net gain which may provide more housing).	It is considered that despite the representations received that the principles of preferred site W2a remains appropriate - however, sites W2a, W2b and W3 will form one policy approach to a comprehensive scheme on this site and will be known as W2.
	NCC Highways.	Support sites (W2a, W2b W3) these sites however need to be treated comprehensively.	Comments noted.	
Object	Barry Merkin, Ian Mackinnon.	Concerns over lack of existing open space and recreation facilities, increased traffic along Watton Road/Norwich Road, access arrangement's, lack of local infrastructure (schools, density, doctors, police, fire service), sewer and flooding.	There is existing infrastructure capacity to accommodate 250 new dwellings and upgrades to education and healthcare provision have been identified. Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints. Flooding mitigation methods will be dealt with on a site by site basis and NCC do not object on highways grounds. Density has	

			been amended to provide 22 dwellings on this site as opposed to 30 to take in to account the surrounding environment and local concern (policy refers to gross no net gain which may provide more housing).	
	Mr Chris Smith.	[104] 032 is a more sustainable site.	Site 104 [032] has been previously scoped through 2008 and 2009 issues and options and has been discounted.	
	Mrs J Seal (TC)	Be allocated as recreation.	Comments noted.	
Comment	Sue Bull (Anglian Water).	Major constraints to provision of infrastructure or treatment for growth in terms of foul sewerage network capacity.	Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered there are no insurmountable constraints.	

Policy W2b - Preferred Residential Allocation - Land to south of Norwich Road – Former RAF Officers Mess

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Bennett Plc on behalf of Gerald Eve LLP.	Support the preferred option for W2b but are concerned that the limited number of dwellings proposed (Policy W2b 50 dwellings on 3.30 hectares at a density of 13.33 dph represents a missed opportunity to provide more homes on land which has mainly been previously developed.	National Guidance has recently removed the requirement for minimum density and allows for local level determination and flexibility. This site is reflected by its surrounding and this is applied in point 2 of policy W2a. Furthermore, the policy refers to gross no net gain which may provide more housing.	It is considered that despite the representations received that the principles of preferred site W2b remains appropriate - however, sites W2a, W2b and W3 will form one policy approach to a comprehensive scheme on this site and will be known as W2..
	NCC Highways.	Support sites (W2a, W2b W3) these sites however need to be	Comments noted.	

		treated comprehensively.		
Object	Barry Merkin, Ian Mackinnon.	Concerns over lack of existing open space and recreation facilities, increased traffic along Watton Road/Norwich Road, access arrangement's, lack of local infrastructure (schools, density, doctors, police, fire service), sewer and flooding.	There is existing infrastructure capacity to accommodate 250 new dwellings and upgrades to education and healthcare provision have been identified. Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints. Flooding mitigation methods will be dealt with on a site by site basis and NCC do not object on highways grounds. Open Space Policy DC11 within the Adopted Core Strategy deals with the protection of existing areas of open space and contributions to open space provision from all new development. Density of W2a has been reconsidered to reflect local character and local concern from 30 dwellings to 22.	
	Mr Chris Smith.	[104] 032 is a more sustainable site.	Site 104 [032] has been previously scoped through 2008 and 2009 issues and options and has been discounted.	
	Mrs J Seal (TC)	Be allocated as recreation.	Comments noted.	
Comment	Sue Bull (Anglian Water).	Major constraints to provision of infrastructure or treatment for growth in terms of foul	Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth	

		sewerage network capacity.	within the town and it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints.	
	Richard and Rose.	Concerns over lack of infrastructure and community services, open space, recreation, density of development, affordable housing provision.	There is existing infrastructure capacity to accommodate 250 new dwellings and upgrades to education and healthcare provision have been identified. Open Space Policy DC11 within the Adopted Core Strategy deals with the protection of existing areas of open space and contributions to open space provision from all new development. Density and open space provision is identified within the Adopted Core Strategy. Density of W2a has been reconsidered to reflect local character and local concern from 30 dwellings to 22.	
	Mrs J Seal (TC).	W2b to be replaced with W11 as the land owner for W11 would give part of the land to the town for a much needed extension to the cemetery.		

Policy W3 - Preferred Open Space Allocation - Land to south of Norwich Road – Former RAF Officers Mess

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Bennett Plc on behalf of Gerald Eve LLP.	Support the preferred option for W3.	Comments noted.	It is considered that despite the representations received that

	Philip Raiswell (Sport England), Town Council.	Sport England would wish to see any new playing fields supported by adequate ancillary facilities such as changing rooms and car parking.	Comments noted.	the principles of preferred site W3 remains appropriate - however, sites W2a, W2b and W3 will form one policy approach to a comprehensive scheme on this site and will be known as W2.
	NCC Highways.	Support sites (W2a, W2b W3) these sites however need to be treated comprehensively.	Comments noted.	
Object	Ian Mackinnon.	Concerns over housing numbers, lack of existing open space and recreation facilities, increased traffic along Watton Road/Norwich Road, access arrangement's, lack of local infrastructure (schools, density, doctors, police, fire service), sewer and flooding.	There is existing infrastructure capacity to accommodate 250 new dwellings and upgrades to education and healthcare provision have been identified. Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints. Flooding mitigation methods will be dealt with on a site by site basis and NCC do not object on highways grounds. Open Space Policy DC11 within the Adopted Core Strategy deals with the protection of existing areas of open space and contributions to open space provision from all new development. Housing numbers have been determined by the Adopted Core Strategy. Density of W2a has been reconsidered to reflect local character and local concern from 30 dwellings to 22.	

Comment	Richard and Rose.	Concerns over lack of infrastructure and community services, open space, recreation, density of development, affordable housing provision.	There is existing infrastructure capacity to accommodate 250 new dwellings and upgrades to education and healthcare provision have been identified. Open Space Policy DC11 within the Adopted Core Strategy deals with the protection of existing areas of open space and contributions to open space provision from all new development. Density and open space provision is identified within the Adopted Core Strategy.	
----------------	-------------------	--	--	--

Policy W4 - Preferred Residential Allocation - Land to north of Norwich Road and south of Watton Green

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Andre Read, C Edwards, John Davies, Ray Luck, Robert Crosthwaite, Shirley Hurdle, Tim Leonard	The site will provide needed communal facilities in open space and play areas. Landscaping and biodiversity will be enhanced. Support for a low density approach and the site will act as a good buffer development between the semi rural Watton Green and the existing housing development. – a logical extension to the settlement boundary. Confirmation of intention from the site owner for site deliverability, infrastructure and policy approach.	Comments noted.	It is considered that despite the representations received that the preferred site W4 remains appropriate. This will be known as W3.

	Mrs J Seal.	Support the inclusion.	Comments noted.	
	NCC Transport.	Subject to a satisfactory access being provided and local improvement works, the Highway Authority supports the inclusion of this preferred site in the plan.	Comments noted.	
Object	Bristow, Trevor Whitmore, Terence Newell.	Concerns over traffic congestion and access. Would like this part of Watton to remain as a 'Hamlet'. Intrusion into the wider landscape and concerns over loss of amenity, concerns over lack of pedestrian access.	NCC has raised no objection subject to access provision and local improvement works.	
	K Mann, Mr Chris Smith, Terence Newell, Mrs Louisa Moth.	Exacerbate existing flooding on Watton Green Road. Drainage and sewerage capacity concerns.	Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints. Flooding mitigation will be dealt with on a site by site basis.	
	Terence Newell.	Vacant buildings to the south west of the Northern part of the site may contain bats.	Bat habitats and mitigation will be dealt with through the planning process.	
Comment	Sue Bull (Anglian Water).	Major constraints to provision of infrastructure or treatment for growth in terms of foul sewerage network capacity.	Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints. Flooding mitigation will be dealt with on a site by site basis.	

	Terence Newell.	Wishes to see more power to local people as a result of the Government agenda.	The Adopted Core Strategy has determined the districts growth agenda. Local level consultation remains unchanged through the planning process.	
--	-----------------	--	--	--

Policy W5 - Preferred Residential Allocation - Land adjacent to Swaffham Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mrs J Seal (TC)	Providing the bridle way be protected and maintained and that vehicle access be restricted over it.	Comments noted.	It is considered that despite the representations received that the preferred site W5 remains appropriate. This will be known as W4.
	NCC Highways.	Supports the inclusion of this preferred site in the plan.	Comments noted.	
Object	Thomas Hough, Mr John Hornagold, Mrs Helen Hornagold.	Concerns over surface water flooding along Three Post Road, Bridle Way and Heyes Lane in addition to exacerbate sewerage failures.	Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints. Flooding mitigation will be dealt with on a site by site basis.	
	Beverly Hough, Mr John Hornagold, Mrs Helen Hornagold.	Concern over loss of wildlife and biodiversity, and this site should be retained for biodiversity purposes.	Comments noted.	
	Beverly Hough	Concern over traffic movements along Swaffham Road, and the roundabout on to Brandon Road including lack of pavements along Swaffham Road.	NCC does not raise objections to the site.	
	P Summers, Mrs Laura Stevens	Should be retained as open	This site is privately owned was	

		space and left as it is.	previously allocated for open space within the 1999 Local Plan. Despite efforts to implement the allocation, there is no longer a reasonable prospect that it will be delivered as public open space.	
Comment	Gedge, Mr John Hornagold, Mrs Helen Hornagold.	Observations with regards to appropriate density and design for housing on site. Density should be reduced. Concern over impact upon amenity for surrounding residential dwellings.	National Guidance has recently removed the requirement for minimum density and allows for local level determination. As a result of local concerns and local character of this area the density has been reduced to 17 dwellings per hectare.	
	Sue Bull (Anglian Water).	Foul sewerage requires upgrading to support growth.	Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints. Flooding mitigation will be dealt with on a site by site basis.	

W6: Alternative Residential Site - Land to the south of the preferred site adjacent Wayland High School and the A1075 (residential only)

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				It is considered that the alternative site W6 remains appropriate. This site will be known as W5.
Object				
Comment	NCC Transport	Subject to satisfactory access being provided there are no highway reasons why this site can not be included within the plan	Comments noted.	

W7: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the north of Merton Road and adjacent to Watton Medical Centre

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				W7 is constrained by its shape, access and on site TPO's. No representations were made through the Preferred Options Consultation which indicated that this site may come forward at this stage. It is situated within the settlement boundary of Watton and therefore, development is acceptable in principle, if a scheme was deemed appropriate for the site. Therefore, it is considered that W7 should be removed from the submission document. It is therefore considered an unreasonable site.
Object	Mrs J Seal (Watton Town Council)	This site should be allocated for recreation. Any access from this site would cause excessive strain on the already congested Merton Road.	Comments noted.	
Comment	NCC Transport	There are no highway reasons why this site can not be included within the plan	Comments noted.	

W8: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the north of Norwich Road.

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				W8 is constrained by its multi ownership, access, on site trees and biodiversity. No representations were made through the Preferred Options Consultation which indicated that this site may come forward at this stage. It is situated within the settlement boundary of Watton and therefore,
Object				
Comment	Mrs J Seal	Suggested replacement as a site specific for W2a.	This site is less deliverable than W2a as a result of multiple ownership and demolition of existing properties to ensure adequate access.	
	NCC Highways	Subject to satisfactory access being provided there are no highway reasons why this site	Comments noted.	

		can not be included within the plan.		development is acceptable in principle, if a scheme was deemed appropriate for the site. Therefore, it is considered that W8 should be removed from the submission document. It is therefore considered an unreasonable site.
	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Upgrading water supply networks and major constraint on foul sewerage capacity networks.	Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints. Flooding mitigation will be dealt with on a site by site basis.	

W9: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the east of the A1075

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				It is considered that alternative option W9 should be removed from the list of alternative options as a result of highway objection. It is therefore considered an unreasonable site.
Object	NCC Highways	The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan.	Comments noted.	
	Mrs J Seal	To be removed from the LDF.	Comments noted.	
Comment	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	The site has waster resource, supply and fouts sewerage issues.	Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints. Flooding mitigation will be dealt with on a site by site basis.	
	Mr & Mrs Dye	This parcel of land which was considered as conforming has resulted through the consultation as becoming an alternative site as a result of flooding. This site should be reconsidered.	Comments noted.	

W10: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land between Hunters Oak and Blenheim Way

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				Whilst Highways have not objected to this site, it is contained my multi ownership, access arrangement which would require demolition, on site trees and biodiversity. No representations were made through the Preferred Options Consultation which indicated that this site may come forward at this stage. Therefore, it is considered that W10 should be removed from the submission document. It is therefore considered an unreasonable site.
Object	Mrs J Seal	To be removed from the LDF.		
Comment	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Needs water supply and foul sewerage upgrades.	Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints. Flooding mitigation will be dealt with on a site by site basis.	
	NCC Highways	There are no highway reasons why this site can not be included within the plan.	Comments noted.	

W11: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the south of Church Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				It is considered that alternative option W11 should be removed from the list of alternative options as a result of highways objection. It is therefore considered an unreasonable site.
Object	NCC Highways	The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan.	Comments noted.	
	Michael Haslam Associates Ltd on behalf of Andrew Garner	This site should become one of the Council's preferred sites. It is well related to Watton town centre and is demonstrably closer to it than the preferred	This site is considered to have landscape constraints in comparison to sites W2a, W2b and W3. The development of the sites would extend north in	

		sites of W2a, W2b, W3 and W4. An Access Appraisal Report on the site has been prepared An Environmental Scoping Study and Indicative Master plan for the development in order to provide evidence of its deliverability.	to a prominent ridge at the shallow valley of Watton Brook.	
Comment	Sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Needs water supply and foul sewerage upgrades.	Anglian Water is aware of waste water constraints and upgrades required as part of future growth within the town and it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints. Flooding mitigation will be dealt with on a site by site basis.	
	Michael Haslam Associates Ltd on behalf of Andrew Garner	Disagree with NCC Highways comments in regards to footpath along Griston Road on sites (104) 027 and (104) 029	Comments noted.	

Unreasonable Sites

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mrs Trudy Crook	Proposals need to be considered in context with existing permissions that are not shown on the maps, in particular the significant developments at Richmond Park Golf Club of 73 holiday homes, apartments and a leisure centre which will impact greatly on traffic flow into and out of Saham Road throughout	Comments noted.	Comments noted.

		the year.	
Object	Mr Chris Smith	Disagree with the Local Planning Authorities assessment of site [104] 002 which results contained access. An application for 91 dwellings has been submitted accompanied by a full transport assessment.	Whilst formal comments from NCC are awaited on this application, traffic the impact upon traffic conditions are a concern. This planning applications has been recommended fro refusal on grounds that the development would be contrary to local and national planning policies that seek to restrict new housing development outside development boundaries and that the proposal would conflict with local polices relating to affordable housing and housing mix, that the proposal would be likely to exacerbate existing sewerage capacity problems in the area and that there is inadequate assessment of the potential flooding problems.
Comment	John Potter	Concerns raised that sites [104] 002 and [104] 032 have been subject to a recent planning application. This is not supported due impact upon landscape and countryside, highways constraints along Saham Road, Brandon Road/High Street Junction. Sewerage, flooding, capacity of local infrastructure.	This application has been recommended fro refusal – see above comment.

Harling

Introduction

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				Comments noted.
Object	Mrs Pam Prior	Concern over too many houses in Harling and the suitability of additional traffic on Kenninghall Road including pedestrian safety.	Overall level of development proposed for Harling is identified in the Adopted Core Strategy. Development will be expected to provide any necessary improvements to local infrastructure to enable it to occur.	
	Mrs Pam Prior	Concern over Harling's sustainability in terms of rail and bus links. There is only 1 rail service per day and a limited bus service. The village has no car parking.	Harling is one of the larger villages with both rail and bus services.	
Comment	Highways Agency	The Highways Agency does not object to the principle of the proposed locations and levels of development as allocated in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals Development	Support noted.	

		Plan Document.	
	Mr M Hustler	Site 042/019 has been represented.	All sites presented have been previously scoped through 2008 and 2009 issues and options and have been discounted.

Policy H1 - Preferred Residential Allocation - Land to the north of Kenninghall Road, adjacent East Harling Primary School

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Cordell	This site would seem preferable to squeezing further houses into the centre of the village.	Support noted.	Despite comments of both support and objection, Harling will have no further housing allocations within the submission document as a result of extant permission on both preferred site H1 and reasonable alternative site H2. The figure of 50 new dwellings identified in Policy SS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy has been exceeded - a total of 65 homes have been approved in Harling since early 2009. As a consequence there is technically no need to allocate land through this Development Plan Document to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy for Harling. The settlement boundary will also be amended to include these planning permissions.
	Mr & Mrs Sellens	This site is supported due to proximity to local amenities, transport improvement with Kenninghall Road and reduction in carbon footprint due to all houses on one site.	Support noted.	
	Mr David Gee (Harling Parish Council)	H1 remains its preferred site.	Support noted.	
	NCC Highways	Subject to local improvement works the Highway Authority supports the inclusion of this preferred site in the plan	Support noted.	
Object	Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Bennett Plc	Consider that Site H3 is a better located site as a result of its location, impact upon wider countryside, Highway Safety associated with Site H1, lack of	A total of 65 homes have been approved in Harling since early 2009. This has been achieved in part through the granting of permission on the preferred	

		<p>footpath along Kenninghall Road. Development of this site will restrict the future expansion of the school. Furthermore, concerns over the development for 40 dwellings on site H1 due to an existing permission already granted for 25 – this exceeding the Core Strategy Policy SS1 for 50 homes.</p>	<p>site (H1) for residential development at Kenninghall Road for 40 dwellings in 2010 and the granting of two separate but adjoining schemes (10 and 15 dwellings) at Lopham Road on a site identified at the Preferred Options stage as a reasonable alternative site (H2). All of these proposals were outside the existing settlement boundary and approved in advance of this Site Specifics document being submitted. As a result, the figure identified in Policy SS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy has been exceeded and as a consequence there is technically no need to allocate land through this Development Plan Document to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy for Harling. Accordingly the settlement boundary will also be amended to include the planning permission at Kenninghall Road (H1) and part of site (H2) - granting of planning permission for 10 houses. (The site for 15 dwellings occupies a</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>peripheral location, distant from services and facilities. Amending the settlement boundary to include this site will limit the Local Planning Authority's ability to reconsider the site against any improvements to the housing land supply position in Breckland).</p>	
	<p>Mr & Mrs Adcock, Mr Atkinson, Mr Jermy, Mr Ken Wright, Mr Lee Distin, Mr M Wright, Mr Stephen Jacobs, Mrs Helen Fearnside, Mrs Pamela Dunkinson, Sue Footer, SW & MS Dunne</p>	<p>Object due to loss of flora and fauna, increased traffic and road accidents, highway safety and visibility from Gallants Lane in to Kenninghall Road, impact of an increased number of additional vehicles converging on Kenninghall Road, impact upon properties opposite H1 in terms of loss of amenity, loss of grade 3 agricultural land, loss of hedgerow along Kenninghall lane, development of this land would restrict future expansion of the school, lack of school places, impact upon drainage, lack of open space provision, loss of wildlife habitat, lack of public transport, loss of landscape amenity, lack of employment opportunity in Harling, there is remaining</p>	<p>A total of 65 homes have been approved in Harling since early 2009. This has been achieved in part through the granting of permission on the preferred site (H1) for residential development at Kenninghall Road for 40 dwellings in 2010 and the granting of two separate but adjoining schemes (10 and 15 dwellings) at Lopham Road on a site identified at the Preferred Options stage as a reasonable alternative site (H2). All of these proposals were outside the existing settlement boundary and approved in advance of this Site Specifics document being submitted. As a result, the figure identified in Policy SS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy has been exceeded and a</p>	

		<p>brown field land available within the town should be utilised first and Kenninghall Road/King Street congestion. There is also concern that Kenninghall Road is the only approach road to the village where there are no parked cars to restrict visibility and that development in this location will to go to the supermarket or shopping and not use local facilities. Consideration should be made to the localism agenda. Cloverfield's on Lopham Road would be a safer alternative.</p>	<p>consequence there is technically no need to allocate land through this Development Plan Document to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy for Harling. Accordingly the settlement boundary will also be amended to include the planning permission at Kenninghall Road (H1) and part of site (H2) - granting of planning permission for 10 houses. (The site for 15 dwellings occupies a peripheral location, distant from services and facilities. Amending the settlement boundary to include this site will limit the Local Planning Authority's ability to reconsider the site against any improvements to the housing land supply position in Breckland).</p>	
	<p>Stephen Faulkner NCC</p>	<p>It felt that the allocation should be relocated to allow for the future expansion of the school.</p>	<p>A total of 25 homes have been approved under 2008 and 2010 planning applications. Norfolk County Council comments with regards to school capacity would have been provided and assessed through the planning process.</p>	

	Mr & Mrs Hasbour	Concern over the future expansion of the school.	A total of 25 homes have been approved under 2008 and 2010 planning applications. Norfolk County Council comments with regards to school capacity would have been provided and assessed through the planning process.
	Mr David Taylor	Concern over proposed density for new developments and open space requirement, land locking of school, highways safety, Norfolk County Councils comments for current application on H1 confirm the primary School is over capacity.	A total of 25 homes have been approved under 2008 and 2010 planning applications. Norfolk County Council comments with regards to school capacity would have been provided and assessed through the planning process. Density will have been established at the planning stage.
	Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Bennett Plc	Concerns due to lack of pedestrian access, encourage car use resulting in being contrary to parts of PPS3. Site H3 is preferable due to accessibility to services, local transport. Development of H1 will land lock the school.	A total of 65 homes have been approved in Harling since early 2009. This has been achieved in part through the granting of permission on the preferred site (H1) for residential development at Kenninghall Road for 40 dwellings in 2010 and the granting of two separate but adjoining schemes (10 and 15 dwellings) at Lopham Road on a site identified at the Preferred Options stage as

			<p>a reasonable alternative site (H2). All of these proposals were outside the existing settlement boundary and approved in advance of this Site Specifics document being submitted. As a result, the figure identified in Policy SS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy has been exceeded and a consequence there is technically no need to allocate land through this Development Plan Document to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy for Harling. Accordingly the settlement boundary will also be amended to include the planning permission at Kenninghall Road (H1) and part of site (H2) - granting of planning permission for 10 houses. (The site for 15 dwellings occupies a peripheral location, distant from services and facilities. Amending the settlement boundary to include this site will limit the Local Planning Authority's ability to reconsider the site against any improvements to the housing land supply</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			position in Breckland).	
Comment	David Taylor	Support site H1 due to highways accessibility, proximity to local amenities, car parking, mini roundabout, speed reduction scheme.	Support noted.	
	Mr David Taylor	Concern that the reason why this site has not been included has been described as 'substandard' as this is misleading.	Planning permission for 15 homes (3PL/2009/0589F) on part of site H2 was dismissed at appeal. A subsequent application has been approved under application 3PL/20100374/F addressing issues raised within the appeal. The Planning Inspector under 3PL/2009/0589F deemed the visibility as acceptable on Garboldisham Road.	
	Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Bennett Plc	Contrary to the views expressed by Mr David Gee, site H3 access road is of the required standard and the Highways Authority indicates that access constraints to Site H3 are not insurmountable. Additionally, development of site H3 would not involve the creation of a lake that would represent danger to children. It would merely involve the relocation of the		

		partially waterlogged areas to the north of the site, to the south of the site.		
	Mrs Sue Bull (Anglian Water).	Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth within the foul sewerage network.	Anglian Water is aware of upgrades required as part of growth within the village and it is considered there are no insurmountable constraints.	

H2: Alternative Residential Allocation -Land adjacent to Lopham Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mr David Taylor	Concern that the reason why this site has not been included has been described as 'substandard' as this is misleading.	Planning permission for 15 homes (3PL/2009/0589F) on part of site H2 was dismissed at appeal. A subsequent application has been approved under application 3PL/20100374/F addressing issues raised within the appeal. The Planning Inspector under 3PL/2009/0589F deemed the visibility as acceptable on Garboldisham Road.	Despite comments of both support and objection, Harling will have no further housing allocations within the submission document as a result of extant permission on both preferred site H1 and reasonable alternative site H2. The figure of 50 new dwellings identified in Policy SS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy has been exceeded - a total of 65 homes have been approved in Harling since early 2009. As a consequence there is technically no need to allocate land through this Development Plan Document to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy for Harling. The settlement boundary will also be amended to include these planning permission.
	Mr David Taylor	The site has met all the PPS3 planning criteria and can easily accommodate the extra 25 homes required for Harling at a low density of 22 per hectare with plenty of play and sports areas.	Support noted. The site has planning permission for 25 homes in total approved under 3PL/2008/0579/F and 3PL/2010/0374/F.	
	Mr David Taylor	Concern that the reason	Support noted. The site has	

		why this site has not been included is a result of the landscape settlement fringe study and the impact upon the Harlings Heathlands Landscape. It was not mentioned at the public enquiry in Feb 2010 and the planning application had recommendation from Breckland's officers.	planning permission for 25 homes in total approved under 3PL/2008/0579/F and 3PL/2010/0374/F.	
Object	NCC Highways	The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan.	The Planning Inspector under planning application 3PL/2009/0589F deemed the visibility as acceptable on Garboldisham Road.	
Comment	Mrs Sue Bull (Anglian Water).	Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth within the foul sewerage network.	Anglian Water is aware of upgrades required as part of growth within the village and it is considered there are no insurmountable constraints.	

H3: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land west of the Glebe

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Bennett Plc	Site H3 is more integrated with the established built up area. Pedestrian access will be provided. The site will encourage walking and cycling. The Site is surrounded by development on three sides; therefore it can more readily be	Support noted.	Despite comments of both support and objection, Harling will have no further housing allocations within the submission document as a result of extant permission on both preferred site H1 and reasonable alternative site H2. The figure of 50 new dwellings identified in Policy SS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy

		regarded as infill development. It has direct access to existing recreational areas and an equipped play area via safe pedestrian footpaths. The site accords to the principles of PPS3.		has been exceeded - a total of 65 homes have been approved in Harling since early 2009. As a consequence there is technically no need to allocate land through this Development Plan Document to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy for Harling. The settlement boundary will also be amended to include these planning permission.
	Mr & Mrs Adcock	Site H3 has existing access capable of absorbing the increase in traffic. The site is centrally placed within the village enabling pedestrian access to doctor's surgery, dentist, shop and post office. It is a good use of existing unused land.	Support noted.	
Object	Mrs G Walters	Concern as this area is designated an area of natural beauty and in winter is often covered in water, presumably from a high water table,	The area is not designated as an area of natural beauty; however the SSSI is located approximately 700m away. However, this site is considered to have biodiversity issues as a result of its surrounding woodland and lack of agricultural activity. The site is considered to have moderate to high sensitivity as identified in the Landscape Character Study and is considered sensitive to development. This is reflected in Core Policy 11 of the Adopted Core	

			Strategy.	
	Mr David Taylor	The waterlogged areas are over a large part of the area proposed, this area floods to a depth of 1-2 feet for several months in the winter.	Whilst this site is located within flood zone 1 (area at least risk from flooding), local knowledge and evidence suggests that the site is prone to water logging. It is a site where a number of water courses are discharge towards the River Thet. Notwithstanding this, the site promoter would be prepared to undertake remedial measures to improve drainage of the site.	
Comment	BDC Contaminated Land	Potential contaminative source or within 250m Contaminated land assessment required before planning permission is granted - DS initially because of the size of development.	This would be addressed at a planning application stage.	
	Mrs sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth within the foul sewerage network.	Anglain Water is aware of upgrades required as part of growth within the village and it is considered there are no insurmountable constraints.	
	NCC Highways	Subject to local improvement works there are no highway reasons why this site can not be	Support noted.	

	Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Bennett Plc	<p>included within the plan.</p> <p>Do not agree with the reasons why this is not a preferred option. Highways have not objected. Natural England only objected to development of the wider site. The northern part of the site is some 700 metres from the SSSI. The development of this site will improve biodiversity interest with the creation of a wetland area to the south and additional tree planting. Due to planning permission now having been granted for 25 homes in Harling, the 25 homes now remaining to be allocated in Harling could very easily be accommodated at the northern edge of site H3 abutting the village centre.</p>	<p>Whilst the SSSI is located approximately 700m away, the site is considered to have biodiversity issues as a result of its surrounding woodland and lack of agricultural activity. The site is considered to have moderate to high sensitivity as identified in the Landscape Character Study and is considered sensitive to development. This is reflected in Core Policy 11 of the Adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>A total of 65 homes have been approved in Harling since early 2009. This has been achieved in part through the granting of permission on the preferred site (H1) for residential development at Kenninghall Road for 40 dwellings in 2010 and the granting of two separate but adjoining schemes (10 and 15 dwellings) at Lopham Road on a site identified at the Preferred Options stage as a reasonable alternative site (H2). All of these proposals were outside the existing</p>	
--	---	---	--	--

			<p>settlement boundary and approved in advance of this Site Specifics document being submitted. As a result, the figure identified in Policy SS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy has been exceeded and a consequence there is technically no need to allocate land through this Development Plan Document to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy for Harling. Accordingly the settlement boundary will also be amended to include the planning permission at Kenninghall Road (H1) and part of site (H2) - granting of planning permission for 10 houses. (The site for 15 dwellings occupies a peripheral location, distant from services and facilities. Amending the settlement boundary to include this site will limit the Local Planning Authority's ability to reconsider the site against any improvements to the housing land supply position in Breckland).</p>	
	Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of	Water logging of parts of	Comments noted.	

	Bennett Plc	the site occurs only at times of extreme rainfall. The development of this site will include extensive drainage improvements.		
--	-------------	---	--	--

H4: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land west of Garboldisham Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				Despite comments of both support and objection, Harling will have no further housing allocations within the submission document as a result of extant permission on both preferred site H1 and reasonable alternative site H2. The figure of 50 new dwellings identified in Policy SS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy has been exceeded - a total of 65 homes have been approved in Harling since early 2009. As a consequence there is technically no need to allocate land through this Development Plan Document to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy for Harling. The settlement boundary will also be amended to include these planning permission.
Object				
Comment	BDC Contaminated Land	Potential contaminative source or within 250m Contaminated land assessment required before planning permission is granted - DS initially because of the size of development.	Comments noted.	
	NCC Highways	Subject to local improvement works there are no highway reasons why this site can not be included within the plan.	Support noted.	
	Mrs sue Bull (Anglian Water)	Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth within the foul sewerage network.	Anglian Water is aware of upgrades required as part of growth within the village and it is considered there are no insurmountable constraints.	

Narborough

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mr Burchell (Parish Council)			The introduction should be updated to reflect current services within the
Object				

Comments	Highways Agency	Due to the small scale of the development proposed, the implications on the highways network are likely to be negligible. Therefore the Highways Agency does not object to the principle of the proposed allocations. Future documents should set out the need for detailed Transport Assessments.	Comments noted	village.
	Mr Bucknell	Evidence underpinning the allocation of this village is now out of date.	Narborough has been designated as a local service centre village through the adopted Core Strategy, due to its high level of service provision. The document should be updated to include the current list of village facilities.	

Policy NAR.1 - Preferred Residential Allocation - Land west of Chalk Lane

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	NCC highways	Whilst some highway improvements would be needed to secure safe access onto this site. It is thought that these are not insurmountable. Improvements needed would include extension to the 30mph speed limit, and provision of pedestrian and cycle access.	Comments noted	Whilst a number of objections have been raised against this site, a number of issues within them are not insurmountable. The Core Strategy has provided a positive housing allocation for Narborough, and it is considered that site NAR.1 still offers the best opportunity to meet this housing allocation.
	Mr Burchell (Parish Council)	The parish council would like	All sites for over 5 dwellings	It is recommended that the preferred

		<p>to see a mixed use development of both affordable and executive homes. Also the inclusion of sheltered housing within the site. The parish council would prefer to see the erection of bungalows on the edge of the development bordering Westfields</p>	<p>would be expected to provide affordable housing, at a rate of 40%. This site would be no exception to this. The exact type and mix of that affordable housing, would need to be agreed with Breckland's housing team, and would be dependent on the current need within the village.</p> <p>Until this application reaches a detailed planning application, the size and type of housing will not be decided. However, there are policies within the Core Strategy, which do require all applications to take into regard the form and character of the surrounding area.</p>	<p>option NAR.1 is carried forward to the proposed submission document, as the best site to meet Narborough's housing allocation.</p>
Object	<p>B Quincy Ms Greeno J Campbell Miss Desborough Mr & Mrs Ellen Mr & Mrs Green Mr & Mrs Pocknell Mr & Mrs Lambert Mr & Mrs Mitchell Mr & Mrs Veness Mr Mitchell Mr Limbert P Smith R Rainstowe</p>	<p>Narborough does not have the facilities to support the current residents within the village, without a further expansion. At present, residents have to drive to Swaffham for the majority of their shopping.</p> <p>NAR.1 is located on the road towards RAF Marham and drivers regularly do not obey the speed limit in this area, making the road dangerous. A</p>	<p>As part of the adopted Core Strategy, Narborough has received a positive housing allocation for 50 houses over the plan period to 2026. The village has been allocated with this level of growth, due to its position as a local service centre, with a high level of service provision. This site is well related to a number of these facilities, and is adjacent the village community centre and playing</p>	

	Mr Bucknell	<p>further access point onto this road would exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>Drainage at Westfield is currently a problem, with flooding occurring during periods of heavy rain.</p>	<p>fields.</p> <p>A number of comments raise concerns about access to this site. NCC highways have appraised each of the site options within Narborough, and have not raised any objections to NAR.1. They have though indicated that a number of measures, including the extension of the speed limit, should occur if this site is to be developed.</p>	
Comment	Mr Bucknell	How would the SSSI and area of biodiversity interest, be protected from development?	<p>It is noted within the policy justification that the is in close proximity to Narborough Railway Embankment SSSI. The site is though approximately 350m from the SSSI, and it is not considered that development here would impact upon it. Additionally, within the policy it is proposed that structural landscaping is provided to the southern boundary, which would minimise the impact of the development from the settlement edge.</p>	
	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Some infrastructure improvements would be needed for this site to be developed. However, these are not insurmountable.	Comments noted.	

NAR.2: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land off Meadow Lane

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mr Burchell (PC)	Some concerns over access past the primary school.	Comments noted.	NCC highways have raised an objection to this site as an alternative option due to access constraints. Therefore, it is recommended that this site is removed from the list of alternative options and becomes an unreasonable option.
Object	NCC highways	Access to the site is insufficient.	Comments noted.	
Comment	Mr Bucknell	Queries the need to build 50 houses in Narborough, however of they are to be built, would rather see them split between NAR.2 and NAR.3	Comments noted. The housing strategy for the whole district has been set through the adopted Core Strategy, and does include an allocation of 50 houses for Narborough.	
	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Some infrastructure improvements would be needed for this site to be developed. However, these are not insurmountable.	Comments noted.	

NAR.3: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the south of Swaffham Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mr Burchell (Parish Council)	Support the site as long as speed limit would be extended to include the entire site.	Comments noted.	It is considered that whilst there has been representations raised against the site, it should still be included as a potential alternative option for development within Narborough. This will be site NAR.2.
	Mr Bucknell	Questions the need for development within Narborough. However, if the development is necessary would support this site.	The housing strategy for the district, including the allocation of 50 houses at Narborough, has been set through the adopted Core Strategy.	

Object				
Comment	NCC highways	The 30mph limit would need to be extended to cover the entirety of the site. In addition, pedestrian and cycle access would also need to be extended along this site.	Comments noted.	
	Mr & Mrs Green	Consider this site to be preferable for future development as opposed to NAR.1, due to it being located on a quieter road, close to the A47.	Comments noted. This site is though located further from the village facilities than NAR.1.	
	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Some infrastructure improvements would be needed for this site to be developed. However, these are not insurmountable	Comments noted.	

Unreasonable Sites

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	No comments received			<p>No further representations were received in regard to these sites within the preferred options consultation. All of the sites were assessed as part of this consultation, and it is considered that they should remain as unreasonable options.</p> <p>Additionally, through representation made within the preferred options consultation. It is recommended that NAR.2 is removed from the list of alternative options and placed within the unreasonable site category.</p>

Shipdham

Introduction

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mr Leonard	Shipdham is a sustainable location for new development. Without development the village will stagnate. Younger people in the village cannot afford to stay in the village, new homes may help this.	Support noted.	It is recommended that the introduction to Shipdham be updated to include a list of current facilities. It is not though considered at this time, that the representations raised adversely affect the proposal. The principle of development and level of growth have already been determined in the Core Strategy.
	Mr Williams	Sites SH5-SH13 have been excluded for a number of reasons. However it should be noted that most people access village facilities via the use of a car, so sites at the edge of the village should not be discounted.	Comments noted.	
Object	Dr Ivan Slaughter M Nicholls Mr & Mrs Duggan Mr & Mrs Simmons Mr Anderson Mr. Keith Wood Mrs Dawn Tindale Mrs Lesley Warman Mrs Mary Fern Mrs Susan Elizabeth Hart Mrs Sylvia Tuck Mr. Keith Wood Mrs Dawn Tindale	<p>The ability of existing village services to cope with additional growth. Many of the services are already at capacity.</p> <p>There are a number of existing planning permissions in the village, which are waiting to be built. Have these houses been considered when the housing numbers were allocated. Should they come of the provision of new homes.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised regarding the impact that building 100 new homes will have on the volumes of traffic passing through</p>	<p>Comments noted. NCC highways department have considered all of the potential sites for development. Whilst they have raised concerns in regard to a few of the sites, these are now suggested to be changed to become unreasonable options. All of the sites going forward as preferred and alternative options have not received any objection from the highways department.</p> <p>The level of housing growth has been set through the core strategy. This has had regard for existing planning</p>	

		the village.	permissions and services within the village., and has allocated Shipdham with 100 new homes for the remainder of the plan period
	Mr Stebbing Mr & Mrs Simmons	The new government supports local housing levels, why is Breckland pushing ahead with the previous targets, when they are no longer set.	Although the RSS has been abolished by the new government, housing levels within Breckland have already been agreed at a local level, through the adoption of the Core Strategy.
Comment	Mr & Mrs Bayliss Mr & Mrs Cossins Mr & Mrs Ralph Mr & Mrs Robinson Mr Chris Hart Mr David Gray W Pound Chris Taylor Mr. Simon Page Mrs Ann Johnson Mrs Joanne Kidd	<p>Concerns have been raised regarding the impact that building 100 new homes will have on the volumes of traffic passing through the village.</p> <p>The ability of existing village services to cope with additional growth. Many of the services are already at capacity.</p> <p>There are a number of existing planning permissions in the village, which are waiting to be built. Have these houses been considered when the housing numbers were allocated. Should they come of the provision of new homes.</p>	<p>Comments noted. NCC highways department have considered all of the potential sites for development. Whilst they have raised concerns in regard to a few of the sites, these are now suggested to be changed to become unreasonable options. All of the sites going forward as preferred and alternative options have not received any objection from the highways department.</p> <p>The level of housing growth has been set through the core strategy. This has had regard for existing planning permissions and services within the village., and has allocated Shipdham with 100 new homes for the remainder of the plan period.</p>

	<p>Mr Dadd (Parish Council)</p>	<p>Lack of consistency in the document for the choice of sites.</p> <p>The number of houses on each of the preferred sites is not a maximum. Could this increase?</p>	<p>Prior to the consultation, each of the sites represented within Shipdham, have been subject to a site visits, and have been considered of an individual basis. The size and locations of each of the sites vary considerably, and the cumulative impact of a number of factors may exclude some sites whilst including others.</p>	
	<p>Cllr P Hewett</p>	<p>Concerns over the ability to achieve safe access to some of the sites.</p> <p>Questions the need for sites to come forward prior to 2014.</p>	<p>NCC highways department have considered all of the potential sites for development. Whilst they have raised concerns in regard to a few of the sites, these are now suggested to be changed to become unreasonable options. All of the sites going forward as preferred and alternative options have not received any objection from the highways department.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has allocated land for development up until 2026. To meet the districts housing need, it is proposed that sites within the LSC are delivered earlier, as the larger strategic sites in Attleborough and Thetford will be delivered later in the plan period. No evidence has been presented to suggest that sites</p>	

			within Shipdham can not be delivered earlier within the plan period.	
	Highways Agency	On account of the small nature of the sites proposed, the impact on the highways network, is likely to be negligible.	Comments noted	

Policy SH1 - Preferred Residential Allocation - Coal Yard and associated buildings, north of Chapel Street

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	NCC highways	Site has frontage onto Chapel Street, which is sufficient to provide an access point. There are existing footways, and the site is centrally located within the village.	Support noted.	This site offers the only opportunity for brownfield development within Shipdham. The site is centrally located, having good access to all of the services and facilities within the village. Despite representation made objecting to this site, it is still considered a viable preferred option, and should be taken forward as such to the proposed submission document. Additionally, it is recommended that the Christmas tree plantation is also included within the site boundary. This would create a more regular shape to the settlement, and also allow for a lower density development, which would be more in keeping
	D. Dodds and P.Dodds (Site owners)	Support the inclusion of site as the preferred option. Land on the west of the site that has currently not been included, is being used as a Christmas tree plantation, and could be included within the site.	Support noted.	
	Margaret Baker Miss Karen Holmes Mr & Mrs Ralph Mr David Stebbing mr paul chubbock mr peter dodd Mr Stebbing	This is the only brown field site put forward. Central location.	Support noted.	

	Mr. Simon Page Mrs Ann Johnson Mrs Foster Mrs Joanne Kidd Mrs T Coe R Sykes and S Chowng			with a village. It should be noted that lower density developments in villages is an approach supported by Policy DC2 Principles of New Housing, within the adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.
Object	D Parfitt Denise Element Gladys Copsey J. Carpenter & D. Pipe Mary Larwood Mr & Mrs Robinson Mr Geoff Hinchliffe Mr Heath Warner Mr Nigel Godfrey Mr Pick Mr R S Caffyn mr robert parfitt Mr T Burrell Mr. Keith Wood Mrs A Payne Mrs P Godfrey Mrs Vicki Parfitt Ms Holly Monton S Forder Mrs Dawn Tindale Mrs Mary Fern Mrs Susan Elizabeth Hart	This site has access directly onto Chapel Street. There are a number of concerns regarding not only the use of Chapel Street as the access point, but also the volume of traffic the site would generate.	NCC highways have not raised any objections to this site.	
	Mr & Mrs Duggan Mr & Mrs M & P Parnell	Objections raised regarding the size of this site, and that it is too	Housing numbers within Shipdham have been set	

	<p>Mr & Mrs Owen Mr & Mrs R & J Rudling Mr & Mrs Tuttle Mr Adam Larwood Mr Adam Moore Mr Daniel Greenwood Mr David Gray Mrs Dawn Tindale Mrs L F Parfitt Mrs Theresa Hewett Ms J Bogglis Mrs Mary Fern</p>	<p>large a development for a rural village.</p> <p>Concern over the ability of the village services to cope with the scale of the new development proposed. As many of the facilities are already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Large scale disruption in the centre of the village.</p>	<p>through the Core Strategy. This site offers the only opportunity for brownfield development within the village.</p> <p>Additionally, the central location of this site, means that the majority of the village facilities are within walking distance.</p>	
Comment	Mr Gilbert Wooldridge (English Heritage)	<p>This site is located within the village conservation area, and yet no mention of this is mentioned within the policy.</p> <p>The site would be a large northerly extension to Chapel Street, and would go against the historic linear form of the settlement.</p>	Comments noted. Reference to the historic context of this part of the village should be included within either the policy or supporting text.	
	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Upgrades to waste water capacity and sewerage.	The issues are not insurmountable, and there are similar concerns across Shipdham.	
	Mr Dadd (Parish Council)	Whilst it is acknowledged that this site is brownfield, there are concerns about the loss of businesses. Although the parish council do not object to housing on this site, a mixed use	Comments noted.	

		development would be preferable.		
	Cllr P Hewett (Ward Representative)	Agreement with the principle of SH1, however not all of the site is brownfield. The Shape of the site, is intrusive into the countryside, and the shape of SH8 may be better. The addition of village shops on the site should be supported.	Comments noted.	
	Cllr T Hewett	Rather than a small area of open space, it would be better to receive contributions towards a larger area of open space.	It is a requirement of DC11 of the adopted Core Strategy, that all developments of over 25 dwellings provide onsite open space.	
	Mr Robinson Mrs Tuck	Concerns over the urbanisation of a rural village, site could be suitable for a smaller scheme.	Housing numbers within Shipdham have been set through the Core Strategy. This site offers the only opportunity for brownfield development within the village.	
	Mr & Mrs Malin	This option is potentially better than other alternative options.	Comments noted.	

Policy SH2 - Preferred Residential Allocation - Land to the south of Chapel Street, formerly Thomas Bullock School Playing Field

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Chris Taylor	Bullock Park has not been looked after previously	Comments noted	A large number of representations have been received in relation to this site, showing a depth of feeling within the village to any proposed development. The highways authority has also
	Mr Raiswell (Sport England)	Whilst this site was the playing field for the school, the equivalent playing field has been relocated at the new school, therefore Sport England would	Comments noted. The site is not classified as protected open space, and development on the site would not conflict with DC11 of the adopted Core Strategy.	

		support the re-use of the site.		<p>raised concerns about this site, stating that it should only be developed in conjunction with site SH1. The feasibility of these two applications coming forward in conjunction with each other creates further complications.</p> <p>Therefore, due to the level of local objection to this site and the highways complications which have emerged, it is recommended that this site should in fact be removed from the list of preferred options and become an alternative option.</p> <p>This site is though located within the Shipdham settlement boundary. Shipdham currently has a deficit of open space, and it is considered that this site could go some way to meeting this deficit. It is therefore recommended that this site is zoned as open space.</p>
	Mr & Mrs Abbott Mr & Mrs Synnock Mr & Mrs Ralph Mr & Mrs Shelly Mrs Kidd Mrs Coe	<p>We believe that smaller developments of 25-30 houses will be better than larger sites.</p> <p>The site is also well related to village facilities.</p>	Comments noted	
	<p>Please see attached list of objectors to this site.</p> <p>477 people have objected to the inclusion of this site.</p>	<p>Objections have been raised to the use of this site for housing, with people wishing to see the site being used as a village green space/children's play area, due to its central location.</p> <p>It should be noted that the majority of objections to this site have been submitted as part of a petition, which was sent to every house in the village.</p>	Comments noted	
Object	K. Goodwille & S. Stolworthy Mr & Mrs Malin Mr & Mrs Appleby	<p>If there is to be development in the village, this would be a good site as it is already within the village. It is currently going to waste as it is not used for anything.</p> <p>Preferred option is better, except could part of it remain as a play area.</p>	<p>The level of housing development has been agreed through the Core Strategy. This site is currently unused, and entirely fenced off, with no existing public access.</p> <p>Any development of over 25 houses, would be expected to provide an on-site children's play area. As noted in policy DC11 of the Core Strategy.</p>	
Comment	NCC Highways	SH2 would need to come forward in conjunctions with SH1, to ensure works to Chapel	Comments noted. The feasibility of including a policy control on the development of the two sites	

		Street are co-ordinated. A policy control should be included with this.	is also questioned.	
	Mr Hinchliffe	This area should be used as a central community area, with a few social housing bungalows around the edges.	Any development of over 25 houses, would be expected to provide an on-site children's play area. As noted in policy DC11 of the Core Strategy.	
	Cllr Paul Hewett (Ward representative)	<p>Recent village surveys have shown that the majority of residents would like to see this site retained for open space.</p> <p>Is such a high proportion of affordable housing located within one area of Shipdham needed? A mixed development would be better.</p> <p>If this site and SH1 are to be developed, rather than two small play areas, would one larger play area shared between the two not be better option.</p> <p>The site has drainage problems.</p> <p>The site has access concerns, as the entrance onto Chapel Street has two protected trees.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The high level of resident's objections to this site and preference for the sites use as open space may also be seen within the objections section.</p> <p>There is a high need for affordable housing within Shipdham, and this site would go some way to meeting this demand.</p>	
	Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge (English Heritage)	The policy does not refer to Shipdham's conservation area, and should be noted within the policy that any development will need to preserve and where	Comments noted.	

		appropriate to enhance it.		
	Mr Keith Wood Mrs Ann Johnson Mrs V Champion	This site offers the opportunity for Shipdham to become a vibrant village, with a central village hall, parking and area of open space.	Comments noted	
	BDC Contaminated Land	A desk study would be need and preliminary site investigation including gas monitoring	Comments noted	
	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Infrastruction upgrades and SUDSwould be needed, but these are not insurmountable.	Comments noted.	

Policy SH3 - Preferred Residential Allocation - Land to the South of Park Estate

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	D Parfitt J Champion J. Carpenter & D. Pipe Mary Larwood Mr Adam Larwood Mr David Stebbing Mr Geoff Hinchliffe Mr I Leonard Mr Neil Robinson mr paul chubbock Mr Stebbing Mr. Simon Page Mrs Ann Johnson Mrs L F Parfitt Mrs T Coe	This is a small site, which could be developed quickly. Would not create more congestion on the A1075 Overall preference for smaller sites.	Support noted.	Whilst a number of objections have been raised against this site, a number of issues within them are not insurmountable. The Core Strategy has provided a positive housing allocation for Shipdham, and it is considered that site SH.3 still offers the best opportunity to meet this housing allocation. It is recommended that the preferred option SH.3 is carried forward to the proposed submission document. This will be known as SH2.

	W Pound			
	NCC Highways	This site has access onto Parklands Avenue, and could link with existing footways. The school is within walking distance.	Support noted	
Object	Mrs Mary Fern Mrs Kidd Mr & Mrs Jordan Mr & Mrs Baker Margaret Baker	Access concerns. The existing road is too narrow and will not cope with this increase in traffic.	NCC highways have not raised any access concerns for this site.	
	Mr Dadd (Parish Council)	The parish council object to the development of this site, due to concerns over access.	NCC highways have not raised any access concerns over this site.	
	McCarthy and Evans Mr & Mrs Rudling Mr Pick Mrs Payne	There are existing drainage issues on this estate.	Anglian Water have indicated that upgrades would be needed to the drainage system. However, these are not insurmountable, and similar upgrades would be needed for all of the sites within Shipdham.	
	Mr & Mrs Robinson Mr Moore Mr Weet Mr Wood Mrs Payne Mrs Tindale Mrs Foster Mrs Kidd R Sykes & S Chowings	Would wish to see this land left as greenfield. Concern about the ability of services within the village to cope with all the additional growth.	There are limited opportunities for development on brownfield sites within the district, due to the rural nature of the district. The majority of brownfield sites have already been developed.	
Comment	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Upgrades to waste water capacity and sewerage.	The issues are not insurmountable, and there are similar concerns across Shipdham.	
	Mr & Mrs Malin	This site represents a better	Comments noted.	

	Mr & Mrs Ralph Mr Chris Hart	option for development than a number of the other sites.		
	BDC Contaminated land	Potential contaminative source within 250m of this site a desk study would be required.	This would occur at the planning application stage.	

SH4 - Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the West of Old Post Office Street

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mr & Mrs Cossins Mr Adam Larwood Mr Adam Moore Mr Neil Robinson Mrs Ann Johnson Mrs Joanne Kidd Mrs L F Parfitt Parfitt Nurseries D Parfitt	The front section of this site is brownfield land. Site has access onto the A1075, and could provide more than one access point.	Support noted.	A number of representations have been received in regards to this site. However it is not consider that the representations raise any insurmountable concerns in regards to the site. Furthermore, the loss of site SH2 as a preferred option, means that there is a balance of 30 houses to be accommodated within Shipdham. This site would offer the opportunity for a partial brownfield development. Whilst this site would be an extension of the existing village into the countryside it is not thought that it would be a prominent as other sites to the east of Shipdham. The recommendation is therefore that part of this site is carried forward to the proposed submission document as a preferred option for development within Shipdham for 30 houses with the inclusion of onsite
	Mr Dadd (Parish Council)	This site could accommodate the same number as SH2 and SH3 combined, and is partially brownfield. The parish council would like to see this site as the preferred option.	Support noted.	
Object	Mr & Mrs Duggan Mr David Stebbing Mr Geoff Hinchliffe Mr Pick Mr Stebbing Mr. Keith Wood	This site is too large and too urban for a village location. The site is also remote from the village services and school, which means that it is likely to generate more vehicle movements.	The objections to this site are noted.	

	Mrs A Payne Mrs Foster J Champion			children's play provision. This will be site SH3.
Comment	NCC Highways	Site has two potential access points onto Watton Road and Old Post Office Street. Local improvements would be needed, including footway provision, though these could be overcome.	Comments noted.	
	Cllr P Hewett (Ward Representative) Cllr T Hewett	Site is approximately the same distance from the village centre as SH3, and also partially brownfield. Site could create an overall benefit to the village.	Comments noted	
	Mr Page	Potential alternative to SH2	Comments noted	
	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Upgrades to waste water capacity and sewerage.	The issues are not insurmountable, and there are similar concerns across Shipdham.	

SH5 - Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the West of Old Post Office Street and land to the east of Little Hale Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	D Parfitt Mr & Mrs Cossins Mr Adam Larwood Mr Adam Moore Mr Neil Robinson Mrs Ann Johnson Mrs Foster Mrs L F Parfitt	Good potential option for the development of 100 houses in Shipdham.	Support noted.	A number of representations have been received in regards to this site, including an objection from Norfolk County Council highways department. As such it is recommended that this site is removed from the alternative options within the proposed submission document, and reclassified as an unreasonable site.
Object	NCC highways	Site is distant from the centre of the village, and there are no	Objection noted.	

		existing footways linking site to centre of the village.		
	Margaret Baker Mr & Mrs Duggan Mr David Stebbing Mr Geoff Hinchliffe Mr Pick Mr. Keith Wood Mrs A Payne Mrs Foster	This site is a large extension into the countryside on predominantly greenfield land. Shipdham is a village and should remain as such. Loss of views across the countryside.	The adopted Core strategy has allocated the level of housing growth for Shipdham. Larger sites do offer advantages over smaller sites for development, including the provision of larger areas of open space in accordance with NPFA standards.	
Comment	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Infrastructure upgrades and SUDS would be needed, but these are not insurmountable	Similar infrastructure upgrades would be needed for all of the sites within Shipdham.	

SH6: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land South of A1075

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mr David Gray Mrs Foster	This would cause less disruption for the centre of the village.	Support noted	The sites on the eastern edge of Shipdham, have high landscape sensitivities, and are likely to need extensive landscaping schemes with development.
Object	K Goodwille & S. Stolworthy Margaret Baker Mr & Mrs Duggan Mr David Stebbing Mr Geoff Hinchliffe Mr Pick mr robert parfitt Mr Stebbing Mr Stuart Abbott Mr. Keith Wood Mrs A Payne Mrs Ann Johnson Mrs L F Parfitt	Development on this site would be too large and would alter the character of Shipdham as you enter the village from Dereham. This would be an unnatural extension to the village. Further linear expansion of the village. Shipdham is a village and should be kept as such.	The objections raised against this site have been noted. The eastern edge of Shipdham, has been classified as having a moderate-high sensitivity to built development, within the landscape character assessment.	The sites at this edge of Shipdham are distant from the services and facilities within the village. It is proposed that these sites are reconsidered within the proposed submission document, and due to there distance from village facilities, and impact on

	Mrs Theresa Hewett Mr D Parfitt			the landscape are marked as unreasonable.
	Mr Abbott Mr Pick	The adjacent field and houses to these sites are known to flood.	Comments noted.	
	Mrs Payne Mr Abbott Mr Hincliffe	These sites on the edge of the village are distant from village services and facilities and people are unlikely to walk to the centre of the village.	Comments noted.	
Comment	BDC Contaminated Lane	Potential contaminative source within 250m of this site a desk study would be required.	This would occur at the planning application stage.	
	Mr N Robinson	Current housing here is dated unattractive. A housing development on the open space could improve the approach to the village.	Comments noted.	
	Mr Dadd (Parish Council)	The parish council would not wish to see these as preferred sites.	Comments noted.	
	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Infrastructure upgrades and SUDS would be needed, but these are not insurmountable	Similar infrastructure upgrades would be needed for all of the sites within Shipdham.	
	NCC highways	Site has frontage onto Dereham Road. Footways would need to be provided to link with existing. Site is distant from village centre.	Comments noted	

SH7 - Alternative Residential Allocation - Land South of A1075 and to the rear of Walnut Meadow

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mr David Gray Mrs Foster	This would cause less disruption for the centre of the village.	Support noted	The sites on the eastern edge of Shipdham, have high landscape sensitivities, and are likely to
Object	K Goodwille & S. Stolworthy	Development on this site would	The objections raised against	

	<p>Margaret Baker Mr David Stebbing Mr Geoff Hinchliffe Mr Pick Mr Stebbing Mr Stuart Abbott Mr. Keith Wood Mrs A Payne Mrs Ann Johnson Mrs L F Parfitt Mrs Theresa Hewett Mr Robert Parfitt D Parfitt</p>	<p>be too large and would alter the character of Shipdham as you enter the village from Dereham. This would be an unnatural extension to the village.</p> <p>Further linear expansion of the village.</p> <p>Shipdham is a village and should be kept as such.</p>	<p>this site have been noted. The eastern edge of Shipdham, has been classified as having a moderate-high sensitivity to built development, within the landscape character assessment.</p>	<p>need extensive landscaping schemes with development.</p> <p>The sites at this edge of Shipdham are distant from the services and facilities within the village.</p> <p>It is proposed that these sites are reconsidered within the proposed submission document, and due to there distance from village facilities, and impact on the landscape are marked as unreasonable.</p>
Comment	BDC Contaminated Land	Potential contaminative source within 250m . A desk study would be required.	This would occur at the planning application stage.	
	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Infrastructure upgrades and SUDS would be needed, but these are not insurmountable	Similar infrastructure upgrades would be needed for all of the sites within Shipdham.	
	Mr N Robinson	Current housing here is dated an unattractive. A housing development on the open space could improve the approach to the village.	Comments noted.	
	Mr Dadd (Parish Council)	The parish council would not wish to see these as preferred sites.	Comments noted.	
	NCC Highways	Site has frontage onto Dereham Road. Footways would need to be provided to link with existing. Site is distant from village centre.	Comments noted	

SH8 - Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the north of Chapel Street

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Margaret Baker Mrs Foster Mrs Theresa Hewett	Housing development here would cause less disruption in the remainder of the village.	Support noted.	Despite the objections raised against this site, it is still considered that it is a viable option to accommodate growth within the village, and as such should be retained as an alternative option within the Proposed Submission document. In addition to this, if it is decided not to include site SH2, as an allocation, this site is one of the more viable alternatives to accommodate Shidham's future housing growth. This will be site SH4.
Object	Mr & Mrs Duggan Mr & Mrs M & P Parnell Mr & Mrs Owen Mr & Mrs Tuttle Mr Adam Larwood Mr David Stebbing Mr Geoff Hinchliffe Mr Heath Warner Mr Pick Mr R S Caffyn mr robert parfitt Mr Stebbing Mr T Burrell Mr. Keith Wood Mrs A Payne Mrs Ann Johnson Mrs Foster Mrs L F Parfitt Ms J Bogglist	This site is far too large, and extends too far out from the existing building line. All of the issues mentioned for SH1 will be magnified. This site is extending into greenfield land – loss of farmland, wildlife and habitat. Access concerns onto Chapel Street, volume of traffic this site would produce.	The adopted Core strategy has allocated the level of housing growth for Shipdham. Larger sites do offer advantages over smaller sites for development, including the provision of larger areas of open space in accordance with NPFA standards. NCC highways have not raised any concerns over the site access.	
Comment	NCC highways	Site has frontage onto Chapel Street, which is sufficient to provide an access point. There are existing footways, and the site is centrally located within the village. Either some or all of the buildings along the A1075 road frontage would be needed to be demolished.	Comments noted	

	BDC Contaminated Land	Records show that part of this site to the north potentially covers part of a filled quarry. A site investigation would be required.	Comments noted. A desk study and site investigation would occur at the planning application stage.	
	Cllr P Hewett (Ward representative)	This site could provide a softer overall shape than SH1. In addition it is also closer to village facilities than other preferred options.	Comments noted.	
	Mr Dadd (Parish Council)	The parish council would not wish to see this included as a preferred site at this time.	Comments noted.	
	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Infrastructure upgrades and SUDS would be needed, but these are not insurmountable	This is similar to all of the sites within Shipdham.	

SH9 - Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the rear of 68-74 Market Street

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mr D Stebbing Mr G Hinchliffe Mr S Page Mrs A Johnson Mrs Foster W Pound	Whilst not central, this site is within walking distance of the school and other village facilities. This would offer small scale development	Comments noted	Changes to PPS3, means that whilst this site was initially classified as brownfield land, it is now greenfield. Whilst a number of representations have been raised for this site, it is thought that it should remain an alternative option. This will be site SH5.
Object	Mr Dadd (Parish Council) D Parfitt Mr Pick Mr R Parfitt Mr K Wood Mrs Payne Mrs L Parfitt	Inadequate access and backland development.	Norfolk County Council have raised no objections to this site on access grounds.	
Comment	NCC Highways	Site has frontage onto Market	Comments noted	

		Street, and existing footways for pedestrian access.		
	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Infrastructure upgrades and SUDS would be needed, but these are not insurmountable	This is similar to all of the sites within Shipdham.	
	Cllr P Hewett	Site offers limited potential. Poor access.	Norfolk County Council have raised no objections to this site on access grounds.	

SH10 - Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the South of Larwood Way

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mr & Mrs Stebbing Mr D Stebbing Mrs A Johnson W Pound	This site is within walking distance of many of the village facilities, and would also prevent further ribbon development.	Comments noted.	Whilst further site investigation would need to be carried out by the developer into this site, it is not thought that at this time, the representation received on the site make it an unviable option as an alternative site. Therefore, the site should remain within the proposed submission document as an alternative option. This will be site SH6.
Object	Mr G Hinchliffe Mr Pick Mr R Parfitt Mr S Page Mrs A Payne Mrs S Tuck	Access to the site would need to be from Larwood Way and Richard Haggard Close, along which there are a number of parked cars. Neither of which would provide suitable access.	Norfolk County Council have not raised any objection to the development of this site on highways grounds.	
	D Parfitt Mrs L Parfitt	This site forms part of the old stone quarry and should not be developed.	Comments noted	
	Mr Dadd (Parish Council) Mrs Foster Mr K Wood Mrs L Duggan	Object to this site being put forward for housing. Extension into the countryside.	Comments noted. This site has been recommended as an alternative option, rather than a preferred.	
Comment	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Infrastructure upgrades and SUDS would be needed, but these are not insurmountable	This is similar to all of the site within Shipdham.	
	Cllr P Hewett (Ward Representative)	Queries the time constraints placed against the site.	Whilst the Core Strategy plans for housing development until	

		Site has suitable access.	2026, development within the local service centre village are expected to come forward much earlier, within this period. With the larger sites in Thetford and Attleborough expected later in the plan period. Earlier delivery of sites, would help towards the districts 5 year supply of land.	
	NCC highways	The site has frontage onto Larwood Way, and there are existing footways. The site is also relatively centrally located. No objections have been raised.	Comments noted.	
	BDC Contaminated Land	This site is potentially a backfilled quarry and site investigation would be required to ensure it is safe to be developed.	Comments noted.	

SH11 - Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the West of Swan Lane

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support Object	Cllr T Hewett	Site has good access onto A1075 and offers the opportunity for a small number of dwellings.	NCC has raised concerns over access onto the site.	Following NCC highways objections to the inclusion of this site, it is recommended that SH11 should be removed from the list of alternative options, and within the proposed submission site it should become an unreasonable option.
	Mr A Larwood Mr G Hinchliffe Mr S Page	This is a small site, which would provide for small number of dwellings, along a quiet street.	Support noted.	
	NCC highways	There are concerns over the suitability of Swan lane, to cope with additional traffic. Whilst the site is close to village facilities, there are no existing footways. Additionally there are concerns	Comments noted	

		over visibility along Swan Lane.		
	Adele Travis D Parfitt M Travis D Travis Mr Robinson Mr R Parfitt Mrs L Parfitt	Objections to the development of this site on access grounds.	NCC highways have also raised concerns over access to this site. As such, it is proposed that the site is placed within the unreasonable list.	
	M Baker Mr Pick Mr Wood Mrs Payne Mrs Foster	This site is an unnatural extension along Swan Lane, which is not suitable for such a large increase in housing. Site would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding countryside	Objections noted.	
	Mr Dadd (Parish Council)	The parish council object to development on this site.	Comments noted.	
Comment	BDC Contaminated Lane	A potential contaminative site within 250m, a desk study would be required prior to development.	Comments noted.	
	Mrs Tuck	This site could be viewed as logical infill, however the road is narrow.	NCC highways have raised objections to the inclusion of this site due to access concerns.	
	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Infrastructure upgrades and SUDS would be needed, but these are not insurmountable	This is similar to all of the site within Shipdham.	
	Cllr P Hewett	This site is small an in obtrusive, with reasonable access onto the A1075.		

SH12 - Alternative Residential Allocation -Land to the North of the A1075

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
-----------------	--------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------

Support	Mr Gray Mrs Foster Mrs Champion	This would cause less disruption for the centre of the village.	Support noted.	<p>This site is on the edge of Shipdham, and any development here would have an impact on the landscape character as you enter the village.</p> <p>The site is also distant from the services and facilities within Shipdham.</p> <p>It is recommended that this site is reconsidered within the proposed submission document and placed within a list of unreasonable sites, due to the landscape.</p>
Object	D Parfitt K Goodwille & S. Stolworthy Margaret Baker Mr & Mrs Duggan Mr David Stebbing Mr G Dadd (Parish Council) Mr Geoff Hinchliffe Mr Pick Mr Stebbing Mr Stuart Abbott Mr. Keith Wood Mrs A Payne Mrs Ann Johnson Mrs Foster Mrs L F Parfitt Mrs Sylvia Tuck Mr. Simon Page	<p>Development on this site would be too large and would alter the character of Shipdham as you enter the village from Dereham. This would be an unnatural extension</p> <p>This area is distant from all of the village facilities, and people would drive into the centre of the village rather than walk.</p> <p>Would make an already long village longer</p> <p>Greenfield land.</p>	<p>The objections raised against this site have been noted. Development on this site would have a large impact on the character of the village as you enter from the Dereham side of the village, due to the flat open nature of the site. Extensive landscaping schemes are likely to be needed in conjunction with any development on this site.</p> <p>Additionally, all of the village facilities are located close to the centre of the village, which is distant from this site.</p>	
	Mr Dadd (Parish Council)	Object to the inclusion of this site.	Comments noted.	
	Comment	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Infrastructure upgrades and SUDS would be needed, but these are not insurmountable	
	BDC Contaminated Land	Potentially close to a contaminative source, a desk study would be needed.	This would occur at the planning application stage.	
	NCC highways	Site has frontage onto Dereham Road. Footways would need to be provided to link with existing. Site is distant from village	Comments noted.	

		centre.		
--	--	---------	--	--

SH13 - Alternative Residential Allocations - Land to the North of the A1075

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Mr David Gray Mrs Foster Mrs V Champion	Whilst these sites are not currently preferred, development here would not impact on the centre of the village in the same way.	Support noted.	This site is on the edge of Shipdham, and any development here would have an impact on the landscape character as you enter the village. The site is also distant from the services and facilities within Shipdham. It is recommended that this site is reconsidered within the proposed submission document and placed within a list of unreasonable sites, due to the landscape.
Object	K Goodwille & S. Stolworthy Margaret Baker Mr David Stebbing Mr Geoff Hinchliffe Mr Pick Mr Stebbing Mr Stuart Abbott Mr. Keith Wood Mrs A Payne Mrs Ann Johnson Mrs Foster Mrs L F Parfitt Mrs Sylvia Tuck D Parfitt	This is a very large site, on greenfield land at the edge of the village, which is not suitable for further development. An example of planning creep – would make a long village even longer. Risk becoming an extension of Dereham rather than a village in our own right. This area is distant from all of the village facilities, and people would drive into the centre of the village rather than walk.	The objections raised against this site have been noted. This site is a smaller version of SH12, and a number of similar issues arise. As noted in the representations, any development on these sites, will have a large visual impact on the approach to Shipdham from Dereham. In an area that the Settlement Fringe Landscape Character Assessment classifies as having a moderate – high sensitivity to development. Any development here, is likely to need extensive landscaping schemes.	
	Mr G Hinchliffe Mr Pick Mrs Payne	Developments on sites of this size are likely to overwhelm present services within the village. Particularly, medical facilities.	Comments noted	

		In addition, the centre of the village does not have enough parking to cope with all the additional cars.		
	Mr Dadd (Parish Council)	The parish council would not wish to see these sites developed.	Comments noted.	
Comment	Mr N Robinson	Development on this site could provide a link onto Letton Road, which would make access safer. It could also improve the visual approach to the village, as housing currently looks dated and not very attractive.		
	BDC Contaminated Land	Potentially close to a contaminative source, a desk study would be needed.	This would occur at the planning application stage.	
	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Infrastructure upgrades and SUDS would be needed, but these are not insurmountable	This is similar to all of the site within Shipdham.	
	NCC highways	Site has frontage onto Dereham Road. Footways would need to be provided to link with existing. Site is distant from village centre and services.	Comments noted.	

Unreasonable Sites

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				The justification behind each of the sites classification as unreasonable, is still considered to be relevant, and it is not
Object				
Comment	NCC highways	Sites appear to have been evaluated inconsistently. There	Each of the sites represented to the Council, were subject to a	

		<p>appears to of been only limited desk based analysis. Some of the sites could come forward immediately under existing planning rules.</p>	<p>site visit. The table displaying unreasonable sites, merely provides a summary of the major constraints identified with the site.</p> <p>In relation to the smaller sites currently inside the settlement boundary. It is acknowledged that these sites could come forward immediately. However, it is considered that due to there size, a strategic housing allocation would not be appropriate.</p>	<p>proposed that this should be changed.</p>
	Mrs Tuck	<p>Land at 36 Letton Road was submitted, this seems to be a better option than some preferred, why it was not considered.</p>	<p>All of the sites submitted to Breckland Council within Shipdham, were analysed both through a desk based study and with a site visit. This site was considered unreasonable due to an objection from the highways authority which stated that Letton Road was unsuitable for the increased vehicular movements that any development would bring about.</p>	

Object		
Comment		

Swanton Morley

Introduction

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer recommendation
Support				
Object				
Comments	Highways Agency	Due to there small nature the highways agency does not consider that the proposed sites will have any adverse impact on the strategic road network.	Comments noted.	

SM1 - Alternative Residential Allocation - Land at Rectory Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support	Strutt and Parker on behalf of Swanton Morley Farms (Site representors)	Supports this site as the preferred option. Swanton Morley has a wide range of facilities to support development. This site is sustainably located in relation to them.	Support noted.	Following representations received on this site, it is still considered that this site is a viable option and should be carried forward within the proposed submission document as the preferred option for development within Swanton Morley.
	Mrs LeBon (Parish Council) Mr Willis	This is the parish council's preferred site for development. There is an existing highways scheme to widen the road at Mill Street. The Parish Council would rather see one large site rather than a number of smaller sites.	One site to accommodate all of the 50 houses proposed, does offer a number of advantage. The site will be required to provide a larger area of on-site open space, in accordance with NPFA standards.	
	NCC highways	A road improvement scheme is currently proposed in this area. Following this scheme, safe access should be able to be provided onto Rectory Road.	Comments noted.	

Object	Mrs Walden Mrs Sadler Mrs Foster	Access concerns onto Rectory Road, Mill Road and Town Street. This is a large scheme, smaller areas would be more appropriate.	NCC highways have not raised highways concerns in regard to this site.	
Comment	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water	Upgrades to the foul water sewerage would be needed if this site was to be developed.	Whilst upgrades would be needed, these are not insurmountable to prevent development.	
	Mr Gilbert-Wooldridge (English Heritage)	Policy SM1 should include reference to preserving the setting of the listed church.	Comments noted. This could either be included within the policy or the reasoned justification.	

Policy SM2 - Preferred Residential Allocation - Land to the West of Manns Lane

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				Whilst representations have been raised in conjunction with this site, it is still considered that site SM2 should be included within the proposed submission document as an alternative option.
Object	Mrs LeBon (Parish Council)	Objects to this as an alternative site	Comments noted	
Comment	BDC Contaminated Land	There is a potential contaminative source within 250m of this site – a desk study would be required.	This would occur at the planning application stage.	
	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water	Upgrades to the foul water sewerage would be needed if this site was to be developed.	Whilst upgrades would be needed, these are not insurmountable to prevent development.	
	NCC Highways	Site has frontage onto Manns Lane. Whilst some improvements would be needed for vehicle access, access would be possible. In addition, site could offer the opportunity	Whilst some improvement would be needed, these are not insurmountable. This site could also have the additional benefit, of improving footways to the primary school.	

		to improve footway provision from Gooseberry Hill to the primary school.		
--	--	--	--	--

SM3: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the East of Manns Lane

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				Whilst representations have been raised in conjunction with this site, it is still considered that site SM3 should be included within the proposed submission document as an alternative option.
Object	Mrs LeBon (Parish Council)	Objects to this as an alternative site	Comments noted	
	Mr Willis	Site constitutes one of the remaining pieces of agricultural land visible from the road through the village. Impact on setting of listed building Kesmark House Inability to achieve safe access	NCC highways have not raised highways concerns in regard to this site. The rural nature of Breckland district means that the majority of housing sites will be located on greenfield land adjacent to existing settlement boundaries.	
Comment	NCC Highway	Site has frontage onto Manns Lane, achieving vehicular access would be dependent on some infrastructure improvement, including increasing footway provision.	Comments noted	

SM4: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the north of Gooseberry Hill

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				Although representations have been made against this site, it is recommended that the site should go forward from the preferred options document in to
Object	Mrs LeBon (Parish Council)	Objects to this as an alternative site	Comments noted	
	Mr Parker (Historic Houses Association)	Concern that any development here should impact on the	Comments noted.	

		setting of grade II listed Kesmark house. If the fields between the property and the village hall were to be development, it would remove the historic setting of the house.		the proposed submission document.
	Mr Willis	Site constitutes one of the remaining pieces of agricultural land visible from the road through the village. Impact on setting of listed building Kesmark House Inability to achieve safe access	NCC highways have not raised highways concerns in regard to this site. The rural nature of Breckland district means that the majority of housing sites will be located on greenfield land adjacent to existing settlement boundaries.	
Comment	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Upgrades to the foul water sewerage would be needed if this site was to be developed.	Whilst upgrades would be needed, these are not insurmountable to prevent development.	
	NCC Highways	Site has frontage along both Gooseberry Hill and Manns Lane. Some improvement would be needed to Manns Lane to provide access, however safe access could be provided from Gooseberry Hill.	Comments noted	

SM5: Alternative Residential Allocation -Land to the South East of Dereham Road

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				Following objections from NCC highways, regarding the ability to gain safe access to this site. It is recommended that this site is removed from the alternative
Object	NCC highways	Site has access onto Dereham Road/Tuddenham Road. A number of improvements to these roads would be needed,	Objection noted.	

		before it would be possible to see if safe access could be provided. The site is also distant from the village centre.		options and placed within the list of unreasonable sites.
	Mrs LeBon (Parish Council)	Objects to this as an alternative site	Comments noted	
Comment	BDC Contaminated Land	Potential contaminative source within 250m of this site, a desk study would be required.	This would occur at the planning application stage.	

SM6: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land to the North West of Greengate.

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				Although representations have been made against this site, it is recommended that the site should go forward from the preferred options document in to the proposed submission document. This will be known as SM5.
Object	Mrs LeBon (Parish Council)	Objects to this as an alternative site	Comments noted	
Comment	BDC Contaminated land	Potential contaminated source within 250m of this a desk study would be required.	This would occur at the planning application stage.	
	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Upgrades to the foul water sewerage would be needed if this site was to be developed.	Whilst upgrades would be needed, these are not insurmountable to prevent development.	
	NCC highways	NCC highways have queried the ability to gain access to this site.	Access to this site would be achieved from Greengate, this would need to utilise third party land, and could be seen as a constraint to development.	

SM7: Alternative Residential Allocation - Land between Primary School and Village Hall

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				Although representations have been made against this site, it is
Object	Mrs LeBon (Parish Council)	Objects to this as an alternative	Comments noted	

Comment	Mrs Bull (Anglian Water)	Upgrades to the foul water sewerage would be needed if this site was to be developed.	Whilst upgrades would be needed, these are not insurmountable to prevent development.	<p>recommended that the site should go forward from the preferred options document in to the proposed submission document.</p> <p>However, a small change to the site area is proposed. This change is to enlarge the site to include the full extent of SM2. The change is proposed, due to the inability for SM7 to come forward without the development of SM2, therefore the development of the entire site would allow for the necessary improvements to Manns Lane.</p> <p>Due to the constraints of the site, whilst not being insurmountable, it is proposed that the site should be retained as an alternative option for development. This will be known as SM6.</p>
	BDC Contaminated land	Potential contaminated source within 250m of this a desk study would be required.	This would occur at the planning application stage.	
	NCC highways	SM7 is located on a substandard road network and the associated vehicular movements would put pressure on other substandard lengths of roads. However, the allocation of SM7 could come forward in association with SM2 as SM2 provides frontage to put in necessary pedestrian improvements.	Comments noted.	

Unreasonable Sites

Category	Respondents	Summary of Comments	Officer Comments	Officer Recommendation
Support				It is proposed that the unreasonable sites should remain as such within the proposed submission document.
Object	J Cook	Site [098]002 site has adequate access for a low density development. Any adverse visual impact would be limited.	This site was previously assessed prior to the publication of the preferred options document, where it was not considered to be suitable for	

			residential development. At this time, it is not thought that there is any new evidence which would alter this.	
	D Wingate on behalf of J Willis	Site [098]004 site has adequate access for a low density development. Any adverse visual impact would be limited. It is also not thought that development of this site would impact upon the listed building.	This site was previously assessed prior to the publication of the preferred options document, where it was not considered to be suitable for residential development. At this time, it is not thought that there is any new evidence which would alter this.	
Comment	Mr R Barlow	Site [098]014 should be considered further. It has access from Bedingfield Road and would not impact on the older part of the village.	This site was previously assessed prior to the publication of the preferred options document, where it was not considered to be suitable for residential development. At this time, it is not thought that there is any new evidence which would alter this.	