

# Housing and Economic Land Availability

## Assessment – part 2

To assess sites put forward during the December 2024 call for sites.

February 2025

# Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1.	About this assessment .....	5
1.2.	The HELAA Methodology .....	5
1.3.	NPPG requirements for the HELAA .....	6
1.4.	What the HELAA is and what the HELAA is not .....	7
1.5.	Colour coding used in table.....	7
1.6.	Next steps.....	7
1.7.	Nutrient enrichment and recreational impact issues.....	8
1.8.	‘Indicative Flood Zone 3b’ .....	8
<b>2.</b>	<b>Land south of Marsh Road, Halvergate .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1.	Map of site .....	9
2.2.	Photos of site.....	10
2.3.	Stakeholder comments .....	11
2.4.	Site assessment .....	16
<b>3.</b>	<b>Land north of Thrigby Road, Filby .....</b>	<b>22</b>
3.1.	Map of site .....	22
3.2.	Photos of site.....	23
3.3.	Stakeholder comments .....	24
3.4.	Site assessment .....	26
<b>4.</b>	<b>Land at Ivy Lane, Oulton Broad .....</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1.	Map of site .....	31
4.2.	Photos of site.....	33
4.3.	Stakeholder comments .....	37
4.4.	Site assessment .....	45
<b>5.</b>	<b>Land at Home Farm, The Street, Thurne .....</b>	<b>62</b>
5.1.	Map of site .....	62
5.2.	Photos of site.....	63
5.3.	Stakeholder comments .....	63
5.4.	Site assessment .....	67
<b>6.</b>	<b>Land off Hall Lane, Postwick.....</b>	<b>72</b>

6.1.	Map of site .....	72
6.2.	Photos of site.....	73
6.3.	Stakeholder comments .....	73
6.4.	Site assessment .....	77
<b>7.</b>	<b>Land north of Marsh Road, Tunstall .....</b>	<b>82</b>
7.1.	Map of site .....	82
7.2.	Photos of site.....	83
7.3.	Stakeholder comments .....	83
7.4.	Site assessment .....	86
<b>8.</b>	<b>Land south of Marsh Road, Tunstall.....</b>	<b>90</b>
8.1.	Map of site .....	90
8.2.	Photos of site.....	91
8.3.	Stakeholder comments .....	92
8.4.	Site assessment .....	94
<b>9.</b>	<b>Land at Broad Lane, Filby .....</b>	<b>99</b>
9.1.	Map of site .....	99
9.2.	Photos of site.....	100
9.3.	Stakeholder comments .....	101
9.4.	Site assessment .....	104
<b>10.</b>	<b>The Old Boatyard, Whitlingham Lane, Trowse.....</b>	<b>109</b>
10.1.	Map of site .....	109
10.2.	Photos of site.....	110
10.3.	Stakeholder comments .....	110
10.4.	Site assessment .....	114
<b>11.</b>	<b>Land at Half Moon Barn, Upper Street Horning.....</b>	<b>119</b>
11.1.	Map of site .....	119
11.2.	Photos of site.....	120
11.3.	Stakeholder comments .....	120
11.4.	Site assessment .....	124
<b>12.</b>	<b>Land to the north of Upper Street Horning.....</b>	<b>128</b>
12.1.	Map of site .....	128

12.2.	Photos of site.....	129
12.3.	Stakeholder comments .....	130
12.4.	Site assessment .....	134
<b>13.</b>	<b>Car Park at former Windboats site, Grange Walk, Norwich Road, Wroxham .....</b>	<b>139</b>
13.1.	Map of site .....	139
13.2.	Photos of site.....	140
13.3.	Stakeholder comments .....	140
13.4.	Site assessment .....	142
<b>14.</b>	<b>Former Windboats Site, Grange Walk, Norwich Road, Wroxham .....</b>	<b>147</b>
14.1.	Map of site .....	147
14.2.	Photos of site.....	148
14.3.	Stakeholder comments .....	150
14.4.	Site assessment .....	153
<b>15.</b>	<b>Land at Marlpit House, Belaugh Green Lane, Coltishall .....</b>	<b>159</b>
15.1.	Map of site .....	159
15.2.	Photos of site.....	160
15.3.	Stakeholder comments .....	161
15.4.	Site assessment .....	163



# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. About this assessment

The purpose of this assessment is to provide information on the range and extent of land which could be considered for development to meet the objectively assessed needs identified for housing and economic development in the Broads across the period 2021-2041. The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) is a key evidence document which supports the preparation of Local Plans. Its purpose is to test whether there is sufficient land to meet the objectively assessed need (OAN) and identify where this land may be located. The HELAA represents just one part of wider evidence and should not be considered in isolation of other evidence.

This is an additional HELAA to the one completed in September 2023: [Broads Authority Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment \(broads-authority.gov.uk\)](https://broads-authority.gov.uk).

This HELAA Part 2 assesses sites put forward through the December 2024 call for sites.

The NPPF says at para 68 'Strategic policy-making authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment'.

The NPPG<sup>1</sup> says an assessment should:

- a) identify sites and broad locations with potential for development;
- b) assess their development potential; and
- c) assess their suitability for development and the likelihood of development coming forward (the availability and achievability).

## 1.2. The HELAA Methodology<sup>2</sup>

This HELAA methodology has been agreed by each of the commissioning Local Planning Authorities (LPAs)<sup>3</sup> in line with the Duty to Cooperate. A consistent methodology across the Norfolk area is considered beneficial and will ensure each LPA prepares its HELAA in a consistent way. This will ensure that each of the individual LPAs understand the level of growth that can be planned for and the areas of each District where the growth could be accommodated. At a more detailed level it will also help the LPAs choose the best individual sites to allocate in Local Plans to meet the growth planned.

The HELAA methodology will apply to the local planning authority areas of:

- a) Breckland Council;

---

<sup>1</sup> [NPPG Housing and economic land availability assessment - GOV.UK](https://gov.uk)

<sup>2</sup> [Norfolk HELAA Methodology July 2016](#)

<sup>3</sup> Commissioning Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) are: Breckland District Council, Broadland District Council, Broads Authority, Great Yarmouth Borough Council, Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk, North Norfolk District Council, Norwich City Council, and South Norfolk District Council.

- b) Broadland District Council;
- c) Broads Authority<sup>4</sup>;
- d) Great Yarmouth Borough Council;
- e) Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk;
- f) North Norfolk District Council;
- g) Norwich City Council; and,
- h) South Norfolk Council.

The Consultation for the HELAA methodology was undertaken across the seven districts and the Broads Authority between 21 March and 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2016. The methodology was broadly supported with most comments seeking greater clarity and context.

Please note that the HELAA methodology has also been applied to residential mooring sites. Although the HELAA methodology was not produced with assessing sites for residential moorings in mind per se but has been used. There are some additional considerations for residential moorings, and these are also included in this document.

The Norfolk HELAA Methodology is based on the HELAA used in the preparation of the East Suffolk (Waveney) Local Plan and so there is still consistency between the part of the Broads in Norfolk and that in Suffolk.

### 1.3. NPPG requirements for the HELAA

The NPPG<sup>5</sup> states some core outputs expected from a HELAA to ensure consistency, accessibility and transparency:

<b>NPPG requirement</b>	<b>Place in this document</b>
a list of all sites or broad locations considered, cross-referenced to their locations on maps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contents page.</li> <li>• Also see section for each site.</li> </ul>
an assessment of each site or broad location, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• where these have been discounted, evidence justifying reasons given;</li> <li>• where these are considered suitable, available and achievable, the potential type and quantity of development, including a reasonable estimate of build out rates, setting out how any barriers to delivery could be overcome and when;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See section for each site.</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> The Broads Authority area includes a small part of Suffolk, and this methodology is consistent with that used by East Suffolk District Council, formerly Waveney District Council, as it produced the Waveney Local Plan.

<sup>5</sup> [Housing and economic land availability assessment - GOV.UK](#)

NPPG requirement	Place in this document
an indicative trajectory of anticipated development based on the evidence available.	This will follow in the Local Plan.

#### 1.4. What the HELAA is and what the HELAA is not

It is important to note that the NPPG says ‘the assessment does not in itself determine whether a site should be allocated for development. It is the role of the assessment to provide information on the range of sites which are available to meet the local authority’s (or, where relevant, elected Mayor or combined authority) requirements, but it is for the development plan itself to determine which of those sites are the most suitable to meet those requirements’. Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 3-001-20190722.

**Important:** A Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment does not allocate land for development. That is the role of the Local Plan. The assessment does not determine whether a site should be allocated or given planning permission for development. The inclusion of a site as ‘suitable’ in the assessment does not imply or guarantee that it will be allocated, nor that planning permission would be granted should an application be submitted for consideration.

Including a suitable site with identified development potential within a HELAA document does NOT confer any planning status on the site but means only that it will be considered as part of local plan production for potential development in the future and, where relevant, for potential inclusion on a statutory Brownfield Sites Register. No firm commitment to bring a site forward for development (either by the commissioning local planning authorities or other parties) is intended, or should be inferred, from its inclusion in a HELAA.

#### 1.5. Colour coding used in table.

Turning to the colour coding used in the HELAA. Please refer to the HELAA Methodology<sup>6</sup> for explanations for the colour used.

#### 1.6. Next steps

Following assessment in the HELAA, these sites will be considered in the round as there could be other issues to consider when deciding to allocate or not these sites that are not considered in the HELAA. Another paper will be produced that summarises each site and proposes a way forward for each of them in terms of the Local Plan.

---

<sup>6</sup> [Norfolk HELAA Methodology July 2016](#)

## 1.7. Nutrient enrichment and recreational impact issues

In some places in this document, there is reference to nutrient enrichment and recreational impact issues. More information can be found here for [GI RAMS](#) and [Nutrient Neutrality](#). But at the time of writing, in all of Norfolk and parts of Suffolk, a tariff system is in operation to mitigate the impacts of recreation as a result of development. And in terms of Nutrient Neutrality, which applies to parts of Norfolk, at the time of writing (December 2024), there were some schemes in place and more were being worked up. The HELAA refers to these as important considerations but does not consider these to be showstoppers.

## 1.8. 'Indicative Flood Zone 3b'


At the time of producing the Strategic Flood Risk Assessments, not all areas have been modelled for flood risk. In the absence of detailed hydraulic model information, a precautionary approach has been adopted with the assumption that the extent of Flood Zone 3b would be equal to Flood Zone 3a. In the SFRAs, this precautionary approach is represented as a separate layer and is termed 'indicative extent of Flood Zone 3b'. If a proposed development is shown to be in Flood Zone 3, further investigation should be undertaken as part of a detailed site-specific Flood Risk Assessment to define and confirm the extent of Flood Zone 3b. This may require detailed hydraulic modelling. Ordinarily, any development in flood zone 3b would not be considered further in the HELAA, but given the precautionary approach, it is noted if the site is in 3b and that is then a consideration later in the assessment tables; it is not seen as a showstopper currently.

## 2. Land south of Marsh Road, Halvergate

### 2.1. Map of site

Residential dwellings/hectare

Land south of Marsh Road, Halvergate



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.



## 2.2. Photos of site



The western boundary of the site.



The existing entrance into the site.



Showing the site and the southern boundary hedge.



There are utilities at the eastern road frontage.



Looking east along Marsh Road



Looking west along Marsh Road

## 2.3. Stakeholder comments

Stakeholder	Comments
<p>Broads Authority Development Management Team</p>	<p>This site is reasonably well sited in terms of being adjacent to existing residential development and partly opposite existing residential development. It is not in flood zones 2 or 3.</p> <p>This is not a village which could be considered as a sustainable location, it does not have a provision of basic services, it does not benefit from good road connections, there are no notable local employment opportunities. This is a location which will depend predominantly on the private motor car for all the needs of the village population.</p> <p>No development boundary, but there is one for Freethorpe, along with the description of Freethorpe, Halvergate and Wickhampton as a village cluster due to the presence of a primary school in Freethorpe. There is an allocation in Freethorpe for 40 dwellings and that could utilise the school spaces.</p> <p>The site is unusual in that it comprises a small section of field to the north of a large field in established arable use, but there do not appear to be any characteristics which would make the subject site land different from the land immediately to the south. In this area it is commonly drainage ditches which separate land and what land is used for, such is the case for the land to the east of the subject site and arable field. There is no ditch between the arable land and subject site, only a hedgerow boundary.</p> <p>On the basis of the above officers do not think this site is appropriate for new housing as it is not a sustainable location.</p> <p>Same comments apply for 4 dwellings scheme.</p>
<p>Broads Authority Heritage and Design</p>	<p>This site is immediately adjacent to the Halvergate Conservation Area, which adjoins it to the north and west and is in close proximity to Halvergate Marshes Conservation Area to the east, both of which are designated heritage assets. Any development here could therefore affect the setting of the designated heritage assets and as such any development will need to ensure that the significance and character and appearance of the areas is not compromised by development within its setting.</p> <p>To the north-east of the site on the opposite side of Marsh Road is the locally listed WW2 Home guard shelter, again the setting of which must be considered.</p> <p>It should also be noted that there is the potential for archaeological remains on the site and as such I would suggest that Norfolk County Council Historic Environment team should be consulted as this could potentially be a constraint on development.</p>

Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>The Norfolk Historic Environment Record states (<a href="#">Record no: 30301</a>) that there are cropmarks of medieval and post medieval date on the site, indicative of a possible moated site and rectilinear enclosure. Another archaeological site also covers a small part of the site (<a href="#">Record no: 49387</a>) with cropmarks of potentially Iron Age or Roman date.</p> <p>A Heritage Impact Assessment would therefore certainly be required for any development on the site.</p> <p>I am mindful of the fact that within the Halvergate Conservation Area Appraisal it is specified on page 40 that there are good uninterrupted views across the marshes from Wickhampton Road, close to Halvergate Hall. Although development does currently extend further east along Marsh Road on the northern side of Marsh Road, its scale, position and the mature hedges in the area mean that it is not prominent in wider views of the village. I therefore have some concerns that development on the proposed site, especially at the density proposed, would impact on the setting of the Halvergate and Tunstall conservation area, by encroaching on its wider landscape setting, which does contribute to the conservation area's significance.</p> <p>However, there may be means of mitigating this harm, for example retention and consolidation of the hedge along the southern edge of the site, retention of as much of the hedgerow along Marsh Road as possible and restricting development to single storey or 1.5 storey (which would also be in keeping with the adjoining development). Rather than cul-de-sac type development, individual properties continuing the established building line (or set back slightly to allow retention of the hedge) with gardens running south would be the most appropriate form of development.</p> <p>To summarise, there are potential impacts on designated and non-designated heritage assets (archaeology – further advice from County required). Development of no more than half of the site (western side) at a low density with low scale buildings may be possible with mitigation measures to minimise harm.</p> <p>Same comments apply for 4 dwellings scheme.</p>
Halvergate Parish Council	Following an informal meeting of Cllrs the inclusion of the land in the Broads Authority development plan was supported and the preference shown for development was for either 4 bungalows or 8 semi-detached bungalows.
Norfolk County Council Heritage	<p>43 dwellings:</p> <p>It is most likely the crop-marks on this site relate to changes in road layout and agricultural activity of post-medieval date. The road is clearly a former continuation</p>



Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>of The Street, out of use by the 1790s as not shown on Faden's map of Norfolk (<a href="http://www.fadensmapofnorfolk.co.uk/">http://www.fadensmapofnorfolk.co.uk/</a>). We would expect results of a geophysical survey be submitted with any planning applications. We would most likely recommend conditions for a post-consent programme of archaeological mitigation starting with trial trenching. <b>The site would be amber in a RAG assessment.</b></p> <p>4 dwellings:</p> <p>For a smaller proposed development of 4 dwelling we would probably recommend conditions for a post-consent programme of archaeological mitigation starting with trial trenching, depending in the location of the application site in relation to the crop-marks. <b>The site would be amber in a RAG assessment.</b></p>
Norfolk County Council Education	<p>43 dwellings:</p> <p>This size and scale of development is likely to increase numbers for the local school to a point it could present an issue for the education authority to place pupils. There is no opportunity to expand the school on its existing site which would mean some children may need transporting to the next nearest school. Due to the rural nature of this part of the county it would be difficult to meet the statutory walking and cycling routes to get children to school sustainably.</p> <p>4 dwellings:</p> <p>This size and scale of housing is not likely to impact the existing local school based on the current forecast detail available.</p>
Broads Authority Landscape Architect	<p>The area appears to be a long thin site and from experience these can be very difficult to develop successful layouts on, and pressure is then placed to remove hedgerows to make space for a sufficiently deep site to contain some back-to-back plots.</p> <p>If this one was to be allocated, the majority of the hedge would need to be retained, so access would need careful consideration.</p> <p>Query how the sites could accommodate 43 residential dwellings here. That's a large number and the edge of the village is mainly bungalows so this would probably need to follow suit and would be a low-density development likely with single or 1.5 storey at most as I can't see how 2 storeys could be acceptable in this location. The site would also need to accommodate green infrastructure, and potentially open space would be required.</p>

Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>The nearest PROW is some distance to the east. Overall the character of the site put forward is that of rural farmland but then very quickly changes to the marshland character to the east. The site is right on the edge of that marshland character, and this makes me very unsure about whether the site could accommodate any development.</p> <p>Reducing the size of the scheme would reduce potential impact, and reflecting the development pattern opposite would make some sense – but I'd want to see the rest of the site included though not developed - and used for BNG/open space and as a way of transitioning into the wider landscape character. Not least because otherwise it would leave a very strange parcel of land which I'm sure would not be particularly usable for the farmer.</p> <p>Overall I'm not keen on this site, especially in the shape and number put forward.</p> <p><i>The Agent then amended the submission to be for 4 dwellings on a small site.</i></p> <p>Reducing the size of the scheme would reduce potential impact, and reflecting the development pattern opposite would make some sense – but I'd want to see the rest of the site included though not developed - and used for BNG/open space and as a way of transitioning into the wider landscape character. Not least because otherwise it would leave a very strange parcel of land which I'm sure would not be particularly usable for the farmer.</p>
Norfolk County Council Highways	<p>43 residential dwellings</p> <p>Highway objection to the proposed allocation. The location has no local facilities and will be reliant on the private car. Furthermore, the scale is out of keeping with the local network.</p> <p>Smaller site area and 4 dwellings</p> <p>Highway objection to the proposed allocation. The location has no local facilities and will be reliant on the private car. A recent appeal for 3 dwellings at a location nearby was dismissed on the availability of local facilities.</p>
Norfolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority.	<p>43 dwellings:</p> <p>Mainly located within Flood Zone 1 but FZ2 and FZ3 directly to the east with a very small area of FZ2 appearing to encroach upon the western site boundary.</p> <p>No on-site sewers – Foul sewers run along the boundary with Marsh Road.</p> <p>Not located within a Source Protection Zone (SPPZ).</p> <p>No flood records on-site or within 500m.</p> <p>On-site: Surface water flow path in 0.1%, 1% and 3.33% AEP events runs along the front of site (Marsh Road) with other minor surface water flowpaths and areas of surface water ponding / pooling in all three AEP events within 500m. The LLFA</p>

Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>consider that there is potential for the presence of the surface water flowpath to impact upon access into site and the number of dwellings proposed.</p> <p>Small part of the site to the west lies within Broads Internal Drainage Board.</p> <p>No onsite watercourses, however ordinary watercourses (some within the IDB area) and drainage ditches are located within 100m. An EA main river also lies within the vicinity of the site (more than 1000m).</p> <p><b>LLFA Assessment: Moderate surface water issues / constraints identified (particularly the presence of the surface water flowpath along Marsh Road) which will require further assessment by the Local Planning Authority (AMBER RAG)</b></p> <p>4 dwellings:</p> <p>Located within Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>No on-site sewers – Foul sewers run along boundary with Marsh Road.</p> <p>Not located within Source Protection Zone (SPZ).</p> <p>No flood records on-site or within 500m.</p> <p>On-site: Surface water flow path in 0.1%, 1% and 3.33% AEP events runs along the front of site (Marsh Road) with other minor surface water flowpaths and areas of surface water ponding / pooling in all three AEP events within 500m. The LLFA consider that there is potential for the presence of the surface water flowpath to impact upon access into site and the number of dwellings proposed.</p> <p>Close to but not located within the Broads Internal Drainage Board area.</p> <p>No onsite watercourses, however ordinary watercourses (some within the IDB area) and drainage ditches located within 100m. An EA main River also lies within the vicinity of the site (more than 1000m).</p> <p><b>LLFA Assessment: Moderate surface water issues / constraints identified (particularly the presence of the surface water flowpath along Marsh Road) which will require further assessment by the Local Planning Authority (AMBER RAG)</b></p>
Anglian Water Services	<p>Anglian Water is the water and sewerage undertaker for this location. There is a sewer along the western boundary and a rising main and pumping station to the east. The pumping station would be in the ownership of AW and therefore should not form part of the site boundary. A minimum buffer of 15m from the pumping station to the boundary of any residential property would be required to avoid any adverse impacts arising from noise or odour for example. There are also easements for many of our underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.</p> <p>The site is within the Freethorpe-Halvergate Rd WRC catchment. There is currently no capacity at the WRC to accommodate growth in the catchment. However, there</p>

Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>is a proposed growth scheme for AMP8 (2025-30) in our PR24 Business Plan – this is subject to final determination by Ofwat which is expected on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2024. The site would need to be phased to allow the growth scheme to be delivered before connecting to our network and WRC. The site allocation policy would need to ensure that the growth scheme is delivered before connecting to our network and WRC i.e. require the developer to demonstrate that there is capacity available in the sewerage network and at the receiving water recycling centre to accommodate wastewater flows from the site.</p> <p>The site for 4 dwellings – this does not include the rising main and pumping station.</p>
Broadland District Council	<p>Broadland has never allocated in Halvergate. There is history of affordable housing exception site development however.</p>
Broads Authority Ecologist	<p>A Habitats Regulation Assessment will apply due to potential impacts of the proposal on European designated sites, namely the Broads SAC and Broadland SPA.</p> <p>Nutrient Neutrality Mitigation will apply due to the locality of the site within the Broads National Park, and the development being located adjacent to designated sites namely Halvergate Marshes part of the Broads SAC &amp; SPA.</p> <p>Ecological assessments will be required to assess the sites habitats and species, and to help mitigate potential impacts of the development proposal.</p> <p>From the information provided the site appears to be currently in arable production, with hedgerows surrounding most of the land parcel. The site is directly adjacent to Halvergate marshes to the east, part of the Broads SAC, Broadland SPA. There is arable land to the south and west, with a mixture of arable and developed land to the north.</p> <p>Existing hedgerows should be retained and enhanced.</p> <p>We would expect Biodiversity net gain to be implemented on site within this sensitive locality close to the Broads European designated SAC and SPA. Biodiversity enhancements including tree and hedgerow planting should be incorporated into the proposal to improve habitat connectivity and provide wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Likely potential for recreational disturbance on nearby designated sites with 43 residential dwellings proposed.</p> <p>Some localised increase in recreational disturbance to designated sites.</p>

## 2.4. Site assessment

Planning history: None on site, but this scheme is near the bus stop and the findings are relevant.

Application number	Description	Decision	Date
BA/2019/0177/NEIGHB Appeal reference: 3245582.	Application for 7 dwellings.	Refused and then appealed. Appeal dismissed: The appeal site would not be a suitable location for new housing. It would not reduce the need to travel nor encourage such by sustainable means. It would serve to promote unsustainable patterns of development, contrary to the Council's settlement hierarchy and consequently the other policies I have cited above.	September 2020

Site address: Land south of Marsh Road, Halvergate		
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.		<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites.</b> <b>According to Agent, previous submissions for this site have been made in 2011 and 2013. See table above.</b>
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>		<b>0.42 hectares</b>
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>		<b>Greenfield – arable</b>
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)		<b>Private</b>
<b>Absolute Constraints Check</b>		
<b>Is the site in a ...</b>		
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>		<b>No (SSSI Impact Zone and SSSI, SAC, SPA and RAMSAR up to eastern boundary)</b>
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Flood risk zone 3b</b>		<b>No - Flood zone 1 according to SFRA</b>
<b>Scheduled Ancient Monument</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Statutory Allotments</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Locally Designated Green Space</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>At risk from Coastal Erosion</b>		<b>No</b>
<i>If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.</i>		
<b>Development Potential</b> (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): <b>43 dwellings initially. Then reduced to 4 dwellings</b>		
<b>Density calculator</b>		<b>9.5 dwellings per hectare – 4 dwellings</b>
<b>Suitability Assessment</b>		
<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Access to site		There is direct access from the public highway.  The speed limit changes partway along Marsh Road frontage to the site.

		If dwellings are along the road frontage, adequate visibility splays required – there is a mature hedge in place currently.
Accessibility to local services and facilities		There is a bus stop nearby with peak hour service (73C) to and from Acle and then onto Great Yarmouth. There is a footway on the north side of Marsh Road, but this stops near the pub. There are no other key services in Halvergate.
Utilities Capacity		The site is within the Freethorpe-Halvergate Rd WRC catchment. There is currently no capacity at the WRC to accommodate growth in the catchment. However, there is a proposed growth scheme for AMP8 (2025-30) in our PR24 Business Plan – this is subject to final determination by Ofwat which is expected on 19 <sup>th</sup> December 2024. The site would need to be phased to allow the growth scheme to be delivered before connecting to our network and WRC. The site allocation policy would need to ensure that the growth scheme is delivered before connecting to our network and WRC i.e. require the developer to demonstrate that that there is capacity available in the sewerage network and at the receiving water recycling centre to accommodate wastewater flows from the site.
Utilities Infrastructure		<p>There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road.</p> <p>There is a sewer along the western boundary and a rising main and pumping station to the east. The pumping station would be in the ownership of AW and therefore should not form part of the site boundary. A minimum buffer of 15m from the pumping station to the boundary of any residential property would be required to avoid any adverse impacts arising from noise or odour for example. There are also easements for many of AW underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.</p>
Contamination and ground stability		Greenfield land, laying fallow currently.
Flood Risk		In flood zone 1, but some elements of surface water flood risk along the northern boundary.
Coastal Change		

Market Attractiveness		Other than limited services and facilities nearby, has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		Hedge will need retaining. There are views through the site to the Broads, including views of Mutton's Mill (Grade 2* listed mill). Reinforcement of the hedges.
Townscape		Reducing the size of the scheme would reduce potential impact, and reflecting the development pattern opposite would make some sense. Rest of site used for BNG/open space and as a way of transitioning into the wider landscape character.
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		SSSI, RAMSAR, SPA and SAC near to the. Would need to mitigate from recreation impacts. Not in scope for nutrient enrichment mitigation. Deciduous woodland/hedges borders site. Not on peat.
Historic Environment		There are potential impacts on designated and non-designated heritage assets (archaeology – further advice from County required). Development of no more than half of the site (western side) at a low density with low scale buildings may be possible with mitigation measures to minimise harm.  Conditions needed for a post-consent programme of archaeological mitigation starting with trial trenching, depending in the location of the application site in relation to the cropmarks.
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		Highway objection to the proposed allocation. The location has no local facilities and will be reliant on the private car. A recent appeal at a location nearby was dismissed on the availability of local facilities.
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		
<b>Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)</b>		
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Policy reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
None		
<b>Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)</b>		
Is the site being marketed? Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where,	No	


by whom, how much for etc.)		
When might the site be available for development (tick as appropriate)	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	✓
	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):		<b>Agent says will take up to 2 years to complete, so 2 dwellings per year is presumed.</b>
Comments	<b>Agent says will take up to 2 years to complete.</b>	
<b>Achievability (including viability)</b>		
Comments	Agent says 'Should an housing allocation be awarded for this site, we would commence marketing to attract a suitable developer. We anticipate an Option Agreement would be negotiated, whilst the developer achieved their Planning Permission. On realising a suitable Planning Permission, we would expect the developer to commence construction, so long as the demand remained'.	
<b>Overcoming Constraints</b>		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheme could consider the SPA, SCA, RAMSAR and SSSI that is next door to the site in its design.</li> <li>• GI RAMS – payment likely.</li> <li>• BNG – on site or off-site mitigation.</li> <li>• Any development here could therefore affect the setting of the designated heritage assets and as such any development will need to ensure that the significance and character and appearance of the areas is not compromised by development within its setting.</li> <li>• To the north-east of the site on the opposite side of Marsh Road is the locally listed WW2 Home guard shelter, again the setting of which must be considered.</li> <li>• A Heritage Impact Assessment would therefore certainly be required for any development on the site.</li> <li>• Conditions needed for a post-consent programme of archaeological mitigation starting with trial trenching, depending in the location of the application site in relation to the cropmarks.</li> <li>• There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road.</li> <li>• A minimum buffer of 15m from the pumping station to the boundary of any residential property would be required to avoid any adverse impacts arising from noise or odour for example.</li> <li>• There are also easements for many of AWS underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open</li> </ul>	



	<p>space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is currently no capacity at the WRC to accommodate growth in the catchment. However, there is a proposed growth scheme for AMP8 (2025-30) in our PR24 Business Plan. The site would need to be phased to allow the growth scheme to be delivered before connecting to our network and WRC.</li> <li>• Ecological assessments will be required to assess the sites habitats and species, and to help mitigate potential impacts of the development proposal</li> <li>• Biodiversity net gain to be implemented on site within this sensitive locality close to the Broads European designated SAC and SPA.</li> <li>• Biodiversity enhancements including tree and hedgerow planting should be incorporated into the proposal to improve habitat connectivity and provide wildlife corridors.</li> <li>• However, there may be means of mitigating this harm, for example retention and consolidation of the hedge along the southern edge of the site, retention of as much of the hedgerow along Marsh Road as possible and restricting development to single storey or 1.5 storey (which would also be in keeping with the adjoining development). Rather than cul-de-sac type development, individual properties continuing the established building line (or set back slightly to allow retention of the hedge) with gardens running south would be the most appropriate form of development.</li> <li>• Include rest of field for BNG/open space and as a way of transitioning into the wider landscape character.</li> <li>• Highway objection to the proposed allocation. The location has no local facilities and will be reliant on the private car.</li> <li>• If dwellings are along the road frontage, adequate visibility splays required – there is a mature hedge in place currently.</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 2 years to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of hedges along road frontage for access to dwellings.</li> <li>• Lack of access to services – only one key service.</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for residential development.	

### 3. Land north of Thrigby Road, Filby

#### 3.1. Map of site



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

### 3.2. Photos of site



Looking northeast along Thrigby Road



At the junction to the farm and Thrigby Road



Looking at the site from the farm access



Showing the site from the farm access



Looking southwest along Thrigby Road



Showing the bend in the road before the site



### 3.3. Stakeholder comments

Stakeholder	Comments
Broads Authority Development Management Team	<p>This proposed site appears clearly outside of the settlement limit, residential development on both sides of the road stop at roughly the same point, this stretches development to one side beyond this point, so there will be inevitable pressure to develop the opposite side and provide the balance which is characteristic of development in Filby.</p> <p>When a village is stretched like this, one end does not wholly feel like it is part of the same village as the other. Filby already has that feel as it stretches along the A1064 and stretches down Thrigby Road. The subject site would only contribute to what already is an unsatisfactory situation.</p> <p>The existing separation between Thrigby and Filby is small, and easily lost through village creep, of which the proposed site is an example.</p>
Broads Authority Heritage and Design	There are no heritage constraints.
Filby Parish Council	<p>Filby Parish Council does not support the proposed site for the following reasons:</p> <p>It is outside the development boundary for Filby</p> <p>It is on a bend which is on a 60mph road so cannot be considered safe</p> <p>It would narrow the gap between the villages of Filby and Thrigby</p> <p>The proposed site is Grade 1 agricultural land and so should not be lost to housing.</p>
Norfolk County Council Heritage	We would recommend conditions for a post-consent programme of archaeological mitigation starting with trial trenching. <b>The site would be amber in a RAG assessment.</b>
Norfolk County Council Education	This size and scale of housing is not likely to impact the existing local school based on the current forecast detail available.
Broads Authority Landscape Architect	In principle this feels like it could be an acceptable allocation as a natural extension of the existing development pattern along Thrigby Road. The northern side of the road which this one relates to has greater capacity than the southern side – simply because of the geometry of the site and that it is somewhat contained before users of Thrigby Road enter a more rural landscape (albeit I understand much of the existing land use around this corner relates to equestrian use). Given the tight curve on this corner, officers are not sure how access would work – that would need careful consideration within any allocation as the visibility splays could be

Stakeholder	Comments
	quite tricky and probably would result in the total loss of the roadside hedgerow, which I would be very much against. Although the plot frontages along Thrigby Road are generally quite open, officers believe it would be appropriate here to retain as much of the hedgerow and rural character as possible, this could create a successful transition into the wider landscape and deal more effectively with the edge of the development boundary – which currently does feel somewhat abrupt.
Norfolk County Council Highways	Highway objection to the proposed allocation. There is a lack of footway provision, the access would require significant tree removal and there is insufficient forward visibility to form a safe access.
Norfolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority.	<p>Located within Flood Zone 1. Flood Zones 2 and 3 lie to the north and east of the site.</p> <p>No on-site sewers – Foul sewers run along boundary with Thrigby Road.</p> <p>Not located within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ)</p> <p>No flood records on-site. External and internal flood records within 500m</p> <p>On-site: None. Off-site Surface water flow paths and small areas of surface water ponding / pooling in 0.1%, 1% and 3.33% AEP events flowpath to impact upon access into site.</p> <p>Small part of the site to the west lies within Broads Internal Drainage Board.</p> <p>On-site: None. Off-site: ordinary watercourses (some within IDB area) and drainage ditches located within 100m.</p> <p><b>LLFA Assessment: No major surface water issues / constraints identified (Green RAG)</b></p>
Essex and Suffolk Water	<p>Thrigby Rd, Filby – We do not appear to have any underground assets running through this land, but any future development would need to check this with us.</p> <p>The development site is close to our land holding – Filby Broad. This is a SSSI and SAC site. As owners we are responsible for the designated features of the site and ensuring they are conserved. As such, any development this close to the protected site should be subject to the relevant environmental checks (for example, HRA) to ensure it would not be detrimental to the features of the site. Particularly relevant would be, how sewage is dealt with because the protected site already has elevated levels of N and P, and light/noise pollution which could affect bird populations. This is not an exhaustive list of considerations.</p>
Anglian Water Services	Anglian Water has no assets within the site boundary and is the sewerage undertaker for this location – the site is within the Caister-Pump Lane WRC catchment, which has sufficient dry weather flow headroom to accommodate the proposed growth.
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Filby is a small village with a limited range of services and facilities (classed as a 'Secondary village' in our existing Local Plan). The site is located off Thrigby Road, which has smaller stretches of footpath provision near to the primary school and junction with Main Road. Street lighting is also provided along most</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>of the length adjacent to which existing residential properties are located and for which a 20/30mph speed restriction is in place. Whilst the site is on Thrigby Road, it lies beyond any footpath provision, is unlit, and close to a bend in the road where national speed limit applies. In this respect, whilst the site is within reasonable walking distance (by proximity) to the primary school, village shop and community hall, it lies within the stretch of the highway which may not be as attractive for walking or cycling than further along Thrigby Road towards the centre of Filby.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The site falls within the Filby Primary School catchment. The latest pupil roll forecasting we have obtained from NCC indicates that the school will be over-capacity within the next five year when taking into account projected growth with no room to expand on the site.</li> </ul>
Broads Authority Ecologist	<p>A Habitats Regulation Assessment will apply due to potential impacts of the proposal on European designated sites, namely the Broads SAC and Broadland SPA.</p> <p>Ecological assessments will be required to assess the sites habitats and species, and to help mitigate potential impacts of the development proposal.</p> <p>From the information provided the site appears to be currently in arable production with hedgerows on the east and southeastern fringe. The land parcel is located between a farm to the west and residential housing to the east. Arable land is located to the north and south of the site.</p> <p>Existing hedgerows should be retained and enhanced.</p> <p>We would expect Biodiversity net gain to be implemented on site within this sensitive locality close to the Broads European designated SAC and SPA. Biodiversity enhancements including further tree and hedgerow planting should be incorporated into the proposal to improve habitat connectivity and provide wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Some localised increase in recreational disturbance to designated sites.</p>

### 3.4. Site assessment

Planning history:

Application number	Description	Decision	Date
BA/1990/3023/HISTAP	Horse driving centre and manufacture of horse drawn vehicles	Approve Subject to Conditions	19 Oct 1990

**Site address: Land north of Thrigby Road, Filby**

<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.		<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites.</b>
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>		<b>0.4 hectares</b>
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>		<b>Greenfield – horse grazing</b>
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)		<b>Private</b>
<b>Absolute Constraints Check</b>		
<b>Is the site in a ...</b>		
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>	<b>No (SSSI Impact Zone)</b>	
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Flood risk zone 3b</b>	<b>No - Flood zone 1 according to SFRA</b>	
<b>Scheduled Ancient Monument</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Statutory Allotments</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Locally Designated Green Space</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>At risk from Coastal Erosion</b>	<b>No</b>	
<i>If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.</i>		
<b>Development Potential</b> (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): <b>5 dwellings.</b>		
<b>Density calculator</b>	<b>12.5 dwellings per hectare</b>	
<b>Suitability Assessment</b>		
<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Access to site		<p>Agent says: There is no existing access to the site. A single new access would be required from Thrigby Road. Alternatively, access could be taken by way of the existing access to Croft Riding School, adjacent to the west. Some minor upgrade works would be required to widen the driveway.</p> <p>There is an access to the farm off Thrigby Road. Road bends just before the site. The speed limit changes part way along Thrigby Road frontage to the site. No footways along Thrigby Road.</p> <p>Highway objection to the proposed allocation. There is a lack of footway provision, the access would require significant tree removal and there is insufficient forward visibility to form a safe access.</p>
Accessibility to local services and facilities		660m to the primary school.

		<p>Around 850m to the post office and bus stop with service with peak hour service to higher order settlement.</p> <p>A development boundary is proposed for the BA part of Filby.</p>
Utilities Capacity		
Utilities Infrastructure		There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road.
Contamination and ground stability		There are no known ground condition issues at this time. The site is utilised as a paddock and so contamination issues are not anticipated.
Flood Risk		In flood zone 1, but some elements of surface water flood risk along the road frontage.
Coastal Change		
Market Attractiveness		Other than limited services and facilities nearby, has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		Hedge to be retained, but given bend and visibility splays, the hedge may be at risk of being removed. Appropriate here to retain as much of the hedgerow and rural character as possible, this could create a successful transition into the wider landscape and deal more effectively with the edge of the development boundary.
Townscape		
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		Would need to mitigate for recreation impacts. Not in scope for nutrient enrichment mitigation. Deciduous woodland/hedges borders site. Not on peat.
Historic Environment		We would recommend conditions for a post-consent programme of archaeological mitigation starting with trial trenching.
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		Highway objection to the proposed allocation. There is a lack of footway provision, the access would require significant tree removal and there is insufficient forward visibility to form a safe access.
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		Agent says: Further residential dwellings and Croft Farm riding Centre are located to the northwest. The nature of the riding centre is such that adverse amenity impacts are not anticipated for either future residents or the users of the riding centre. Indeed, the stables and paddocks are already closely related to residential



		dwelling, seemingly without issue. Appropriate landscaping could be introduced to enhance separation.
<b>Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)</b>		
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Policy reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
None		
<b>Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)</b>		
Is the site being marketed? Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where, by whom, how much for etc.)	No	
When might the site be available for development (tick as appropriate)	Immediately	✓
	Within 5 years	✓
	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):		<b>Agent says will take up to 2 years to complete, so 3 dwellings per year is presumed.</b>
Comments	<b>Agent says will take up to 2 years to complete.</b>	
<b>Achievability (including viability)</b>		
Comments	Agent says 'The site is well related to the main built form of Filby; an attractive and thriving village. The land is in single ownership and the landowner is keen to redevelop. There are no known technical constraints, or abnormal conditions affecting the site; indeed the site is not identified as being at risk of flooding and the waste water treatment works serving the village are identified as discharging outside of the nutrient neutrality catchment. As such it is considered that the site would be attractive either to self-builders or to small developers'.	
<b>Overcoming Constraints</b>		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conditions for a post-consent programme of archaeological mitigation starting with trial trenching</li> <li>• Scheme would need to consider the woodland on the boundary with the road, retaining hedge along the frontage.</li> <li>• Highways concern regarding access visibility and hedge removal.</li> <li>• Scheme would need to consider the surface water issues along the road frontage.</li> <li>• GI RAMS – payment likely.</li> <li>• Confirmation of surface water issues on the road frontage which may need addressing.</li> <li>• Access on a bend where national speed limits apply.</li> </ul>	


	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 1 agricultural land – this cannot be overcome.</li> <li>• Eroding gap between Thrigby and Filby - this cannot be overcome.</li> <li>• Would put development pressure on the site opposite, in GYBC planning area.</li> <li>• There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road.</li> <li>• Ecological assessments will be required to assess the sites habitats and species, and to help mitigate potential impacts of the development proposal.</li> <li>• We would expect Biodiversity net gain to be implemented on site within this sensitive locality close to the Broads European designated SAC and SPA. Biodiversity enhancements including further tree and hedgerow planting should be incorporated into the proposal to improve habitat connectivity and provide wildlife corridors.</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 2 years to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 1 agricultural land.</li> <li>• Eroding gap between Thrigby and Filby.</li> <li>• Would put development pressure on the site opposite, in GYBC planning area.</li> <li>• Conflict between removal of hedge for visibility and need to retain hedge for townscape/landscape purposes.</li> <li>• Access on a bend where national speed limits apply.</li> <li>• Highways objection to proposed allocation.</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for residential development.	

## 4. Land at Ivy Lane, Oulton Broad

### 4.1. Map of site

Residential moorings:


Call for sites - December 2024  
NR33 8HY - Area 1



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Residential caravans:


Call for sites - December 2024  
Land at Ivy Lane NR33 8HY



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Residential dwellings:





© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

## 4.2. Photos of site

### Residential caravans and houses site:





Showing the central area of the site. Looking from the footpath to the train track.



The north west corner of the site. Showing the public footpath.



Taken from the south west corner, looking north east – train track to the right.



The boundary between the two fields that make up the site.



Showing the eastern area of the site.



Showing the eastern boundary with the holiday park.





Looking west along the footpath with the site to the left.

### Residential moorings site:



Looking towards where the residential moorings would be from the public footpath.



Showing where the residential moorings would be



Showing where the residential moorings could be.



Looking back towards the public footpath from near the water's edge.



**Photos showing the access to the site:**



Showing the mature trees and track to the site/hotel.



Access from main road to road towards the site.



Showing the track to the hotel/site.





The public footway runs through the neighbouring holiday park.

### 4.3. Stakeholder comments

General comment about the area from the Broads Authority Heritage and Design Officer: The site is located to the south and west of the Oulton Broad conservation area but it has the potential to impact on the setting of the conservation area (a designated heritage asset) and the setting of Ivy Farm, a 19<sup>th</sup> century farmstead which is considered a local identified heritage asset (see [Suffolk HER](#)) and so this needs to be considered.

Comment from Suffolk CC Highways regarding the rail bridge: It is difficult to tell without an understanding of the intensification the development would present – alongside an understanding of existing trips – of which the Transport Assessment would be expected to cover. There could be concerns if the bridge is already constrained and the development intensifies the use in a significant way that it could create a new issue / exacerbate an existing issue to an unacceptable degree, should it lead to additional queues which result in highway safety issues. However, at this time that is unknown and as above, the Transport Assessment should cover this.

Stakeholder	Residential moorings	Residential caravans	Residential dwellings
Broads Authority Development Management Team	This would have landscape impacts, pulling the built development at the Tingdene Marina further along the sensitive Broad edge. The existing marina at least had the caravan site as a partial backdrop; the adjacent area does not have the same benefit.	<p>This is a lot of development at a site where the access to the A146 from Ivy Lane is so poor. Considering the additional daily vehicle movements I am not sure highways will like it.</p> <p>The existing caravan site has visual impact, even in</p>	This is a lot of development at a site where the access to the A146 from Ivy Lane is so poor. Considering the additional daily vehicle movements, and the expected number of vehicles at 2 per dwelling,

Stakeholder	Residential moorings	Residential caravans	Residential dwellings
	<p>Access appears to be poor, and the site would be remote from any parking area.</p> <p>Officers do not think we could support this.</p>	<p>the context of surrounding development. Any further use for caravans in this area would only be acceptable if the site is not visible from the Broad. The land at the SWT visitor centre site slopes upwards, not sure if it does the same on the east of Ivy Lane.</p>	<p>I am not sure highways will like it.</p> <p>It would be beneficial if this site was reasonably screened, but given the housing to the south of the railway line it would not appear particularly out of place and broadly corresponds with the settlement edge.</p>
Broads Authority Heritage and Design	<p>This site is located to the east of the Tingdene Marina. The area is currently undeveloped and forms part of an area of undeveloped riverbank, with reedbeds and natural landscape running along the south and east of Oulton Broad. The provision of residential moorings, along with all the ancillary paraphernalia here, would detrimentally change the character of the area and would not be considered to preserve and enhance the setting of the conservation area.</p>	<p>Firstly there is the potential for archaeological remains in the vicinity of Ivy Lane as there was a Palaeolithic find in the vicinity (see <a href="#">Suffolk HER record</a>) and World War Two defences to the west of the site (see <a href="#">Suffolk HER record</a> and <a href="#">here</a>). These would potentially be constraints.</p> <p>I would have concerns that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the setting of Ivy Farm, a locally identified heritage asset.</p>	<p>Firstly there is the potential for archaeological remains in the vicinity of Ivy Lane as there was a Palaeolithic find in the vicinity (see <a href="#">Suffolk HER record</a>) and World War Two defences to the west of the site (see <a href="#">Suffolk HER record</a> and <a href="#">here</a>). These would potentially be constraints. There may be some potential for a lower density residential development than that proposed, that takes into account the potential archaeological constraints and the setting of Ivy Farm, a locally identified heritage asset. Equally the scale, layout and design of any development would need to limit visual impact on the wider open landscape to the north (Oulton Broad) and west (towards Carlton Marshes).</p>

Stakeholder	Residential moorings	Residential caravans	Residential dwellings
Oulton Broad Parish Council	<p>The planning committee for Oulton Broad Parish Council have reviewed the local plan and unanimously agreed to reject any use of the land.</p> <p>Concerns over an overdeveloped small area which is prone to flooding, access via the small lane next to Ivy House Farm, where current disputes have taken place with dog walkers and the farm owners.</p> <p>The Parish Council would NOT like this added to the Local Plan.</p>		
Suffolk County Council Education	<p><b>Early Years:</b> There is currently a deficit of places in the ward so additional places would increase this deficit.</p> <p><b>Primary:</b> Dell Primary is forecast to have a deficit of places so additional demand on places would increase this deficit. However, part of the catchment area includes the East Suffolk Local Plan Kirkley Waterfront and Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood development. There have been ongoing discussions about this site with East Suffolk Council, particularly about primary provision across the area.</p> <p><b>Secondary:</b> East Point Academy is forecast to have a deficit of places so additional demand on places would increase this deficit. The availability of places will be monitored with additional places being provided via local secondary school provision where required.</p>		
Broads Authority Landscape Architect	<p>I have reviewed the site for the suggested use of residential moorings. I would not support this one going forward given that the edge of the broad in this location is currently fairly natural and this would result in the introduction of an engineered edge that would erode the character of this part of the broad. I'd also be concerned that there would be an impact on the land beyond Landspring Drain if a development of this nature would require any on land infrastructure</p>	<p>I have reviewed the site for 250 residential caravan use, development of this site would result in the enclosure and urbanisation of the land which currently appears to be used as paddocks, increasing the area of settled broad. From a desktop review, it is not clear if development of this parcel of land could be visible from the broad itself and from properties to the north along Broadview Road, however the overall character would be negatively impacted by any development here, and I therefore wouldn't support the use of this site for residential caravans.</p>	<p>I have reviewed the site for 80 residential dwellings, the introduction of dwellings and associated infrastructure here would result in the enclosure of the land, urbanisation and increase the settled area of the broad. The introduction of dwellings in this area would not fit well with surrounding land uses and would likely have some visual impact as well as character impact when considering the context and surrounding landscape. Though not strictly a landscape issue, I also struggle to see how adequate access could be</p>

Stakeholder	Residential moorings	Residential caravans	Residential dwellings
			created for this site, without significant impact on Ivy Lane itself. I therefore wouldn't support this site going forward.
SCC Archaeological Service	<p>The site is situated in an area of archaeological potential recorded on the County Historic Environment Record (HER), the northern most part of the site is partially within an area recorded as part of a medieval turbary, indicated by account rolls for Flixton-by-Lowestoft dated 1355/7 (HER number LWT 153), which is highly suggestive of peat deposits within the immediate area.</p> <p>Within the eastern part of the site runs a series substantial WW2 period defensive system (LWT 284), consisting of an anti-tank ditch, barbed wire obstructions, lines of anti-tank cubes, including pillboxes, gun emplacements, slit trenches and weapon pits running between Oulton Broad, Lowestoft to Pakefield. These defences form part of a wider system of defences which encircled Lowestoft (LWT 309). Further WW2 defensive systems have been recorded to the east and west of the proposed sites, which comprise a search light batter and type 22 pillbox (LWT 268) and the site of a type 22 pillbox along with slit trench and barbed wire obstacles are located to the east of the proposed sites (LWT 271).</p> <p>To the east of the site is an area of cropmarks of intermittent ditch type features of unknown date (LWT 311). Additionally, archaeological excavation near to the site recorded the presence of early medieval archaeology along with preserved fish traps and wood (OUL 040)</p> <p>As a result, there is high potential for the proposed sites to contain archaeological heritage assets, including palaeo-environmental remains and preserved organic archaeological remains.</p> <p>We would advise trenched archaeological evaluation, comprising 5% sample of the proposed redline area along with appropriate palaeo-environmental sampling strategy is undertaken to inform on the archaeological potential of the sites and decisions on the need for further archaeological work before the commencement of development will be made on the results of the evaluation. SCCAS would recommend that this work is undertaken at the earliest opportunity, however, we would not be opposed to the archaeological evaluation, mitigation, reporting, archiving and public dissemination being secured by appropriately worded conditions in accordance with The NPPF (paras 217 and 218 December 2024).</p> <p>Due to the presence of substantial WW2 features SCCAS would strongly recommend a UXO survey of the sites are undertaken prior to the required archaeological works commencing.</p>		

Stakeholder	Residential moorings	Residential caravans	Residential dwellings
Suffolk County Council Highways	<p><b>15 residential moorings:</b> Unlikely to present a significant impact on highways. Consideration should be given to providing suitable pedestrian accessibility through potential improvements to existing Lowestoft Footpath(s) 14 and 15 which passes through the site and subsequently connect to Marsh Road to the east.</p>	<p><b>250 residential caravans:</b> Traffic impacts will need to be considered through a suitable Transport Statement. Details of the likely traffic generation should be provided to establish potential impacts on the local highway network. Any assessment should consider existing traffic generation associated with the site to provide an understanding of the impacts the development proposal would have. This will assist in determining any additional network modelling / mitigation requirements. Consideration should be given to providing suitable pedestrian and cycle accessibility to the site through potential improvements to Ivy Lane and improvements to existing Lowestoft Footpath(s) 14 and 15 which pass through the site and subsequently connect to Marsh Road to the east.</p>	<p><b>80 residential dwellings:</b> Traffic impacts will need to be considered through a suitable Transport Assessment. The Transport Assessment would need to be multi-modal (assessing all modes of travel), assessing the impacts on the highway network and determining required mitigation, as well as ensuring that safe and suitable access is provided for all users and appropriate measures to promote sustainable and active modes of travel are taken. As with the other examples, one way of improving accessibility to the site would be to provide suitable pedestrian and cycle accessibility to the site through potential improvements to Ivy Lane and improvements to existing Lowestoft Footpath(s) 14 and 15 which pass through the site and subsequently connect to Marsh Road to the east.</p>
Suffolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority.	<p>I have reviewed all sites, and the ones proposed for caravans are at low risk of surface water flooding while the moorings one is at high risk however given this likely to be a water compatible use we don't have any concerns regarding this. NB: the mapping is due to be updated on January 28<sup>th</sup> so risk level may change.</p> <p>Both sites are at high risk of river/coastal flooding so need to bear this in mind and the LPA will need to consult EA regarding this.</p>		

Stakeholder	Residential moorings	Residential caravans	Residential dwellings
	<p>Advice re requirements for sustainable drainage systems can be found on the SCC Website <a href="#">Guidance on development and flood risk - Suffolk County Council</a>.</p>		
Anglian Water Services	<p>There are no Anglian Water assets within the proposed site areas below – AW is the sewerage undertaker for this location. The sites are adjacent to the Lowestoft WRC catchment where there is dry weather flow permit headroom and therefore capacity to accommodate growth.</p> <p>With regard to residential moorings – I assume given existing moorings in this location, there will be pump out facilities nearby to meet The Broads LP policy requirements?</p> <p>The caravan/dwelling proposals would need to take account of climate change allowances when considering flood risk and ensure appropriate SuDS to mitigate surface water run-off from the site.</p> <p>In terms of connections to our network, we would require early engagement from the developer to ensure that there is a sustainable point of connection to our network. Our policy recommendation would still apply - to <b><u>require the developer to demonstrate that that there is capacity available in the sewerage network to accommodate wastewater flows from the site.</u></b></p>		
East Suffolk Council	<p><b>Site Description</b> Foreshore. Area of low-lying grassland with the Land Spring Drain running from east to west. South of site comprises small fields and dense hedges and trees.</p> <p><b>Road Access</b> Road access is via Ivy Lane onto the A146. Suffolk County Council Highways will need to be consulted about the capacity of Ivy Lane, as well as the safety of the junction with the A146.</p> <p><b>Railway</b> Ivy Lane crosses the A146 via a narrow bridge. It will be necessary to consult Network Rail and Suffolk County Council</p>	<p><b>Site Description</b> Three large fields. They are used by a dog training business and an electric vehicle charging station. The eastern field contains a number of trees.</p> <p><b>Road Access</b> Road access is via Ivy Lane onto the A146. Suffolk County Council Highways will need to be consulted about the capacity of Ivy Lane, as well as the safety of the junction with the A146.</p> <p><b>Railway</b> Ivy Lane crosses the A146 via a narrow bridge. It will be necessary to consult</p>	<p><b>Site Description</b> Three large fields. They are used by a dog training business and an electric vehicle charging station. The eastern field contains a number of trees.</p> <p><b>Road Access</b> Road access is via Ivy Lane onto the A146. Suffolk County Council Highways will need to be consulted about the capacity of Ivy Lane, as well as the safety of the junction with the A146.</p> <p><b>Railway</b> Ivy Lane crosses the A146 via a narrow bridge. It will be necessary to consult</p>

Stakeholder	Residential moorings	Residential caravans	Residential dwellings
	<p>Highways about the safety and capacity of the bridge.</p> <p><b>Surrounding Uses</b> Ivy House Country Hotel; Ivy Pit scrap dealers; Ivy Farm Stables Caravan and Motorhome Club. All located to west of proposed residential moorings. Existing static caravans located to the east.</p> <p><b>Listed Buildings</b> There are no listed buildings on or near the site.</p> <p><b>Conservation Area</b> The site is not located in a conservation area.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk</b> The northern edge of the site, which is the location of the 15 residential moorings, is located within Flood Zone 3b (functional flood plain). Residential houseboats would be a compatible use for flood zone 3b.</p> <p><b>Further work needed</b> Gas, electricity and water infrastructure on the site.</p> <p>There is no indication from the information submitted whether use of the moorings would be brought forward in tandem with either of the two uses discussed below.</p>	<p>Network Rail and Suffolk County Council Highways about the safety and capacity of the bridge.</p> <p><b>Surrounding Uses</b> Ivy House Country Hotel; Ivy Pit scrap dealers; Ivy Farm Stables Caravan and Motorhome Club. All located to west of proposed residential caravans. Existing static caravans located to the east. Railway runs along southern edge with housing beyond.</p> <p><b>Listed Buildings</b> There are no listed buildings on or near the site.</p> <p><b>Conservation Area</b> The site is not located in a conservation area.</p> <p><b>Relevant Policies</b> The settlement boundary, as defined by Waveney Local Plan policy WLP1.2 (Settlement Boundary) is located on the opposite side of the railway line to this site.</p> <p>There is no neighbourhood plan in Oulton Broad.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk</b> This site sits further south and most of it is located in flood zone 1. However, the north and east of the site</p>	<p>Network Rail and Suffolk County Council Highways about the safety and capacity of the bridge.</p> <p><b>Surrounding Uses</b> Ivy House Country Hotel; Ivy Pit scrap dealers; Ivy Farm Stables Caravan and Motorhome Club. All located to west of proposed residential dwellings. Existing static caravans are located to the east. Railway runs along southern edge with housing to the south.</p> <p><b>Listed Buildings</b> There are no listed buildings on or near the site.</p> <p><b>Conservation Area</b> The site is not located in a conservation area.</p> <p><b>Relevant Policies</b> The settlement boundary, as defined by Waveney Local Plan policy WLP1.2 (Settlement Boundary) is located on the opposite side of the railway line to this site.</p> <p>There is no neighbourhood plan in Oulton Broad.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk</b></p>

Stakeholder	Residential moorings	Residential caravans	Residential dwellings
		<p>are located within or bordering flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p><b>Further work needed</b> Gas, electricity and water infrastructure on the site.</p>	<p>This site sits further south and most of it is located in flood zone 1. However, the north and east of the site are located within or bordering flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p><b>Further work needed</b> Gas, electricity and water infrastructure on the site.</p>
<p>Broads Authority Ecologist</p>	<p>The area extending north to Oulton Broad is situated on peat a finite resource, which supports Section 41 habitats namely fen, reedbed and wet woodland. These in turn support protected species such as water vole, otter, GCN and Schedule 1 birds.</p> <p>From the aerials – Section 41 habitats are present, with connectivity to important semi natural habitats likely supporting other protected species such as roosting and commuting bats.</p> <p>There should be no net loss of Section 41 habitats and connecting semi natural habitats should be retained and enhanced.</p> <p>This site is therefore not considered appropriate for development due to the potential for significant impacts on biodiversity. Development would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity.</p>	<p>From the aerials this area appears to support semi-natural grassland with boundary hedgerows and trees, as well as mature trees within the site. These habitats are likely to support protected species such as bats, birds, reptiles. Loss of natural habitats and connectivity would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity.</p> <p>Likely to be water quality impacts.</p> <p>Likely potential impacts of the proposal on European designated sites, namely the Broadland SPA and Broads SAC.</p> <p>This site is not considered appropriate for development due to the potential for significant impacts on biodiversity. Development would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity.</p>	



Stakeholder	Residential moorings	Residential caravans	Residential dwellings
	<p>Likely potential impacts of the proposal on European designated sites, namely the Broadland SPA and Broads SAC.</p> <p>Likely to be water quality impacts.</p>		
Broads Authority Waterways and Recreation Officer	For the Oulton Broad Residential Moorings, keep footpath intact, potentially widen to make more accessible.	-	

#### 4.4. Site assessment

Planning history:

Application number	Description	Decision	Date
BA/2023/0222/FUL	Change of use of agricultural land to dog walking field	Approved	25/07/2023
BA/1994/6179/HISTAP	Retention of wooden landing stage and narrow plank access	Approved	19/07/1994
BA/2007/0070/OUT	Erection of 53 timber holiday lodges	Withdrawn	06/08/2007
BA/2007/0316/OUT	Erection of 53no timber holiday lodges	Refused on grounds of over intensive development, impact on character and appearance of area and additional hazards to traffic.	27/06/2008
BA/1997/6272/HISTAP	Alterations to flood defences	Approved	03/10/1997
Application adjacent to the site: BA/2018/0149/FUL	<p>Broadlands Marina, Marsh Lane, Oulton Broad.</p> <p>24 new private and 4 new visitor pontoon moorings as an extension to the Marina; removal of moorings within the reedbed area and a section of jetty; creation of additional reedbed, and reinstatement of slipway and pump out facilities.</p>	Approved	07/08/2019

<b>Site address: Land at Ivy Lane, Oulton Broad</b>		
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.	<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites.</b> <b>See table at start of this section for planning history.</b>	
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>	<b>2.27 hectares</b>	
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>	<b>Greenfield – reedbed</b>	
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)	<b>Private</b>	
<b>Absolute Constraints Check</b>		
<b>Is the site in a ...</b>		
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>	<b>Yes – part of area is SSSI Impact Zone and SSSI, SAC, SPA and RAMSAR, but that area could be removed from any allocation.</b>	
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Flood risk zone 3b</b>	<b>Yes - Flood zone 3b, but this is for residential moorings. Also at risk of tidal flooding with allowance for climate change.</b>	
<b>Scheduled Ancient Monument</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Statutory Allotments</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Locally Designated Green Space</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>At risk from Coastal Erosion</b>	<b>No</b>	
<i>If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.</i>		
<b>Development Potential</b> (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): <b>15 residential moorings</b>		
<b>Density calculator</b>	<b>-</b>	
<b>Suitability Assessment</b>		
<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Score</b> <b>red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Access to site		<p>Vehicles currently access the area to get to the uses along the track, but the use will increase given the proposals.</p> <p>A new access would need to be made to the site from the area of the Hotel. A parking area would also need to be put in place.</p> <p>Concern about the capacity of the bridge of the railway for more traffic and construction traffic.</p>

		<p>South of the rail track, there is a made road with a footway – 7.37m wide in total. The railway bridge is around 4m wide with no footway. The track between the railway bridge and hotel varies in width from just under 3m to around 3.8m with passing places. It is presumed that a road of similar width to that to the south of the railway, with a footway would be required. This would mean the hedge to the east of the track/west of the site is likely to need to be removed in its entirety.</p> <p>There is a footpath that would need to be considered in any scheme.</p>
Accessibility to local services and facilities		<p>From the current moorings to Tesco Express and the bus stop, it is around 1km. GP and school are around 1.5km away.</p> <p>If an access were to be put in place along the waterfront, through the neighbouring boatyards then a bus stop with peak hour service is around 500m away, GP is around 900m away and school is around 1km away.</p>
Utilities Capacity		Generally acceptable although detail regarding sewerage disposal required.
Utilities Infrastructure		There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road.
Contamination and ground stability		
Flood Risk		Part in flood zone 2, 3 and 3b. Part is also at risk from tidal flooding when climate change considered. This is for residential moorings, however.
Coastal Change		
Market Attractiveness		Other than limited services and facilities nearby, has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		The edge of the broad in this location is currently fairly natural and this would result in the introduction of an engineered edge that would erode the character of this part of the broad.
Townscape		Site is on peat. Peat a finite resource, which supports Section 41 habitats namely fen, reedbed and wet woodland. These in turn support protected species such as water vole, otter, GCN and Schedule 1 birds.

		Settlement fringe area.
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		SSSI, RAMSAR, SPA and SAC near to the site. Would need to mitigate from recreation impacts. Deciduous woodland/hedges borders site. Site is on peat and the scheme relies on a new basin being created. Development would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity.
Historic Environment		The site is located to the south and west of the Oulton Broad conservation area but it has the potential to impact on the setting of the conservation area (a designated heritage asset) and the setting of Ivy Farm, a 19 <sup>th</sup> century farmstead which is considered a local identified heritage asset (see <a href="#">Suffolk HER</a> ) and so this needs to be considered. As a result, there is high potential for the proposed sites to contain archaeological heritage assets, including palaeo-environmental remains and preserved organic archaeological remains. Within the eastern part of the site runs a series substantial WW2 period defensive system (LWT 284). The provision of residential moorings, along with all the ancillary paraphernalia here, would detrimentally change the character of the area and would not be considered to preserve and enhance the setting of the conservation area.
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		A small-scale residential moorings development with appropriate highway access is unlikely to give rise to any severe detrimental impact in highway terms.
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		This would bring a residential use near to a boatyard and holiday accommodation. There is a public footpath.
<b>Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)</b>		
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Policy reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
None		
<b>Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)</b>		
Is the site being marketed? Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where, by whom, how much for etc.)	No	
When might the site be available for development	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	✓

(tick as appropriate)	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):		<b>12 per year.</b>
Comments	<b>Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete.</b>	
<b>Achievability (including viability)</b>		
Comments	No information provided by applicant to assess this.	
<b>Overcoming Constraints</b>		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new access would need to be made to the site from the area of the Hotel. A parking area would also need to be put in place.</li> <li>• Capacity of rail bridge to accommodate more traffic, including construction traffic, unknown.</li> <li>• Railway bridge is narrow when compared to access to existing dwellings near to Tesco.</li> <li>• Mature hedgerow at risk in order to accommodate road and footway.</li> <li>• Ensure footpath is considered and access maintained.</li> <li>• Access along waterfront through neighbouring boatyards may be useful.</li> <li>• Overhead cables.</li> <li>• Usual flood risk considerations for residential moorings.</li> <li>• Would result in the introduction of an engineered edge that would erode the character of this part of the broad.</li> <li>• Site is on peat. Would involve peat excavation – this cannot be overcome.</li> <li>• GI RAMS – payment likely.</li> <li>• BNG – on site or off-site mitigation.</li> <li>• Development would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity.</li> <li>• Would require a trenched archaeological evaluation, comprising 5% sample of the proposed redline area along with appropriate palaeo-environmental sampling strategy is undertaken to inform on the archaeological potential of the sites and decisions on the need for further archaeological work before the commencement of development will be made on the results of the evaluation.</li> <li>• Due to the presence of substantial WW2 features SCCAS would strongly recommend a UXO survey of the sites are undertaken prior to the required archaeological works commencing.</li> <li>• Part of site put forward is SPA, SAC, RAMSAR and SSSI – that could be removed from any allocation.</li> <li>• Scheme would need to consider the SPA, SCA, RAMSAR and SSSI that is next door to the site in its design.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located in settlement fringe landscape character area – this cannot be overcome.</li> <li>• Concerns about changing the character of the area – this cannot be overcome.</li> <li>• Require the developer to demonstrate that there is capacity available in the sewerage network to accommodate wastewater flows from the site.</li> <li>• Some impact on education</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 1 year to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peat excavation.</li> <li>• Settlement fringe area.</li> <li>• Changing character of the area.</li> <li>• Mature hedgerow at risk in order to accommodate road and footway.</li> <li>• Assessment required regarding capacity of bridge to accommodate more traffic and construction traffic.</li> <li>• Development would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity.</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for a new basin for residential moorings.	

#### 4.5. Additional considerations for residential moorings

Criteria	Assessment
<b>1: How many residential moorings or what length of residential moorings is proposed?</b>	15 – in a new marina.
<b>2: What services and facilities are nearby for people living on boats to use (for example pharmacy, GP, school or shop)? Where are these facilities and how far are they?</b>	See above
<b>3: Are there moorings already? If so, what is the current use of the moorings (e.g., public, private, marina etc.)?</b>	No – a new marina or basin would be required.
<b>4: Would residential moorings here reduce the width of the navigation channel and impact on the ability of boats to pass?</b>	No – Oulton Broads is fairly wide.
<b>5: Is riverbank erosion an issue here? How would this be addressed?</b>	Marina/basin would be excavated and likely have hard edging.
<b>6: What are the adjacent buildings or land used for</b>	Hotel, moorings and caravan park.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
<b>7: What is the character or appearance of the surrounding area?</b>	Reedbed, natural edge, Broad, hotel, moorings and caravan park.
<b>8: Is there safe access between vessels and the land without interfering with or endangering those using walkways?</b>	This could be part of any scheme. No basin or marina in place.
<b>9: What car parking is there for people living on boats (e.g., car park or park on road)?</b>	Car parking would need to be provided nearby as part of the scheme.
<b>10: How can service and emergency vehicles access the area safely?</b>	No access currently, but likely an access delivered as part of the scheme.
<b>11: How would waste and sewerage be disposed of?</b>	Mains
<b>12: Is the area on mains sewerage?</b>	Yes
<b>13: Would a residential mooring in this location prejudice the current or future use of adjoining land or buildings?</b>	Not considered it would. Although it is bringing residential moorings nearer to a boatyard/other moorings.
<b>14: Who owns the site? If not, who does and have you told them about your proposal?</b>	Site promoter
<b>15: What is the current use of the site?</b>	Reedbed and natural edge.



Site address: Land at Ivy Lane, Oulton Broad		
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.		<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites.</b> <b>See table at start of this section for planning history.</b>
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>		<b>5.85 hectares</b>
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>		<b>Greenfield – dog training and grazing for horses and cows.</b>
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)		<b>Private</b>
<b>Absolute Constraints Check</b>		
<b>Is the site in a ...</b>		
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>	<b>No (SSSI Impact Zone)</b>	
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Flood risk zone 3b</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Scheduled Ancient Monument</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Statutory Allotments</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Locally Designated Green Space</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>At risk from Coastal Erosion</b>	<b>No</b>	
<i>If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.</i>		
<b>Development Potential</b> (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): <b>250 residential caravans</b>		
<b>Density calculator</b>	<b>42.74 dwellings per hectare</b>	
<b>Suitability Assessment</b>		
<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Score</b> red/amber/green	<b>Comments</b>
Access to site		<p>Vehicles currently access the area to get to the uses along the track, but the use will increase given the proposals.</p> <p>Concern about the capacity of the bridge of the railway for more traffic and construction traffic.</p> <p>South of the rail track, there is a made road with a footway – 7.37m wide in total. The railway bridge is around 4m wide with no footway. The track between the railway bridge and hotel varies in width from just under 3m to around 3.8m with passing places. It is presumed that a road of similar width to that to the south of the railway, with a footway would be required. This would mean the hedge to the east of the</p>

		<p>track/west of the site is likely to need to be removed in its entirety.</p> <p>There is a footpath that would need to be considered in any scheme.</p>
Accessibility to local services and facilities		<p>Taking distances from the centre of the field...</p> <p>Using the track through the neighbouring site, train station is around 600m away, bus stop is around 800m away, school is around 1.4km away, GP is around 1.4km away.</p> <p>Using the main track in a southerly direction to the A146, Tesco Express is 550m away and the bus stop is 600m away.</p>
Utilities Capacity		Generally acceptable although detail regarding sewerage disposal required.
Utilities Infrastructure		There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road.
Contamination and ground stability		The land is used for grazing and dog agility.
Flood Risk		In flood zone 1, but northern boundary in flood zone 2 and also at risk of tidal flooding with allowance for climate change.
Coastal Change		
Market Attractiveness		Other than limited services and facilities nearby, has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		The overall character would be negatively impacted by any development here.
Townscape		<p>Development of this site would result in the enclosure and urbanisation of the land.</p> <p>Significant trees on site.</p> <p>Settlement fringe landscape.</p>
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		<p>Loss of natural habitats and connectivity would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity. Significant trees on site. These habitats are likely to support protected species such as bats, birds, reptiles. Loss of natural habitats and connectivity would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity.</p> <p>Hedge bordering the track is likely to need to be removed in its entirety to accommodate an access road and footway.</p> <p>Site is close to peat.</p>

Historic Environment		<p>The site is located to the south and west of the Oulton Broad conservation area but it has the potential to impact on the setting of the conservation area (a designated heritage asset) and the setting of Ivy Farm, a 19<sup>th</sup> century farmstead which is considered a local identified heritage asset (see <a href="#">Suffolk HER</a>) and so this needs to be considered. As a result, there is high potential for the proposed sites to contain archaeological heritage assets, including palaeo-environmental remains and preserved organic archaeological remains. Within the eastern part of the site runs a series substantial WW2 period defensive system (LWT 284). Due to the presence of substantial WW2 features SCCAS would strongly recommend a UXO survey of the sites are undertaken prior to the required archaeological works commencing.</p> <p>Concerns that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the setting of Ivy Farm, a locally identified heritage asset.</p>
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		<p>Traffic impacts will need to be considered through a suitable Transport Statement. Details of the likely traffic generation should be provided to establish potential impacts on the local highway network. Any assessment should consider existing traffic generation associated with the site to provide an understanding of the impacts the development proposal would have.</p>
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		<p>There is a train line bordering the site to the south. That being said, there are properties already in place near the line. A successful hotel operates at the end of the track. There is a public footpath.</p>
<b>Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)</b>		
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Policy reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
None		
<b>Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)</b>		
Is the site being marketed? Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where, by whom, how much for etc.)	No	
When might the site be available for development	Immediately	✓
	Within 5 years	✓

(tick as appropriate)	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):		<b>Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete, so 250 dwellings per year is presumed.</b>
Comments	<b>Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete.</b>	
<b>Achievability (including viability)</b>		
Comments	No information provided by applicant to assess this.	
<b>Overcoming Constraints</b>		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheme would need to consider the mature trees on site.</li> <li>• GI RAMS – payment likely. And as this is over 50 units of accommodation, open space.</li> <li>• BNG – on site or off-site mitigation.</li> <li>• Would require a trenched archaeological evaluation, comprising 5% sample of the proposed redline area along with appropriate palaeo-environmental sampling strategy is undertaken to inform on the archaeological potential of the sites and decisions on the need for further archaeological work before the commencement of development will be made on the results of the evaluation.</li> <li>• Due to the presence of substantial WW2 features SCCAS would strongly recommend a UXO survey of the sites are undertaken prior to the required archaeological works commencing.</li> <li>• Capacity of rail bridge to accommodate more traffic, including construction traffic, unknown.</li> <li>• Concerns about setting of Ivy Farm.</li> <li>• Development would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity.</li> <li>• Some impact on education</li> <li>• Consider dwellings near to a railway and amenity impacts.</li> <li>• Traffic impacts will need to be considered through a suitable Transport Statement.</li> <li>• Hedge bordering the track is likely to need to be removed in its entirety to accommodate an access road and footway.</li> <li>• Located in settlement fringe landscape character area – this cannot be overcome.</li> <li>• Concerns about changing the character of the area – this cannot be overcome.</li> <li>• Require the developer to demonstrate that that there is capacity available in the sewerage network to accommodate wastewater flows from the site.</li> <li>• There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road.</li> <li>• Amenity impacts of railway</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure footpath is considered and access maintained.</li> <li>• Railway bridge is narrow when compared to access to existing dwellings near to Tesco.</li> <li>• Mature hedgerow at risk in order to accommodate road and footway.</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 1 year to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement fringe area.</li> <li>• Changing character of the area.</li> <li>• Assessment required regarding capacity of bridge to accommodate more traffic and construction traffic.</li> <li>• Development would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity.</li> <li>• Setting of Ivy Farm</li> <li>• Mature hedgerow at risk in order to accommodate road and footway.</li> <li>• Concern re impact on mature trees on site.</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for residential development.	

Site address: Land at Ivy Lane, Oulton Broad		
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.		<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites.</b> <b>See table at start of this section for planning history.</b>
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>		<b>5.85 hectares</b>
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>		<b>Greenfield – dog training and grazing for horses and cows.</b>
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)		<b>Private</b>
<b>Absolute Constraints Check</b>		
<b>Is the site in a ...</b>		
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>	<b>No (SSSI Impact Zone)</b>	
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Flood risk zone 3b</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Scheduled Ancient Monument</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Statutory Allotments</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Locally Designated Green Space</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>At risk from Coastal Erosion</b>	<b>No</b>	
<i>If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.</i>		
<b>Development Potential</b> (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): <b>80 residential dwellings</b>		
<b>Density calculator</b>	<b>13.68 dwellings per hectare</b>	
<b>Suitability Assessment</b>		
<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Score</b> red/amber/green	<b>Comments</b>
Access to site		<p>Vehicles currently access the area to get to the uses along the track, but the use will increase given the proposals.</p> <p>Concern about the capacity of the bridge of the railway for more traffic and construction traffic.</p> <p>South of the rail track, there is a made road with a footway – 7.37m wide in total. The railway bridge is around 4m wide with no footway. The track between the railway bridge and hotel varies in width from just under 3m to around 3.8m with passing places. It is presumed that a road of similar width to that to the south of the railway, with a footway would be required. This would mean the hedge to the east of the</p>

		<p>track/west of the site is likely to need to be removed in its entirety.</p> <p>There is a footpath that would need to be considered in any scheme.</p>
Accessibility to local services and facilities		<p>Taking distances from the centre of the field...</p> <p>Using the track through the neighbouring site, train station is around 600m away, bus stop is around 800m away, school is around 1.4km away, GP is around 1.4km away.</p> <p>Using the main track in a southerly direction to the A146, Tesco Express is 550m away and the bus stop is 600m away.</p>
Utilities Capacity		Generally acceptable although detail regarding sewerage disposal required.
Utilities Infrastructure		There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road.
Contamination and ground stability		The land is used for grazing and dog agility.
Flood Risk		In flood zone 1, but northern boundary in flood zone 2 and also at risk of tidal flooding with allowance for climate change.
Coastal Change		
Market Attractiveness		Other than limited services and facilities nearby, has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		The overall character would be negatively impacted by any development here.
Townscape		<p>Development of this site would result in the enclosure and urbanisation of the land.</p> <p>Significant trees on site.</p> <p>Settlement fringe landscape.</p>
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		<p>Loss of natural habitats and connectivity would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity. Significant trees on site. These habitats are likely to support protected species such as bats, birds, reptiles. Loss of natural habitats and connectivity would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity.</p> <p>Hedge bordering the track is likely to need to be removed in its entirety to accommodate an access road and footway.</p> <p>Site is close to peat.</p>



Historic Environment		<p>The site is located to the south and west of the Oulton Broad conservation area but it has the potential to impact on the setting of the conservation area (a designated heritage asset) and the setting of Ivy Farm, a 19<sup>th</sup> century farmstead which is considered a local identified heritage asset (see <a href="#">Suffolk HER</a>) and so this needs to be considered. As a result, there is high potential for the proposed sites to contain archaeological heritage assets, including palaeo-environmental remains and preserved organic archaeological remains. Within the eastern part of the site runs a series substantial WW2 period defensive system (LWT 284). Due to the presence of substantial WW2 features SCCAS would strongly recommend a UXO survey of the sites are undertaken prior to the required archaeological works commencing.</p> <p>Concerns that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the setting of Ivy Farm, a locally identified heritage asset.</p>
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		<p>Traffic impacts will need to be considered through a suitable Transport Statement. Details of the likely traffic generation should be provided to establish potential impacts on the local highway network. Any assessment should consider existing traffic generation associated with the site to provide an understanding of the impacts the development proposal would have.</p>
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		<p>There is a train line bordering the site to the south. That being said, there are properties already in place near the line. A successful hotel operates at the end of the track. There is a public footpath.</p>
<b>Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)</b>		
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Policy reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
None		
<b>Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)</b>		
<p>Is the site being marketed?</p> <p>Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where, by whom, how much for etc.)</p>	No	
When might the site be available for development	Immediately	✓
	Within 5 years	✓

(tick as appropriate)	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):		<b>Agent says will take up 3-5 years to complete, so 16 to 27 dwellings per year is presumed.</b>
Comments	<b>Agent says will take up to 3-5 years to complete.</b>	
<b>Achievability (including viability)</b>		
Comments	No information provided by applicant to assess this.	
<b>Overcoming Constraints</b>		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheme would need to consider the mature trees on site.</li> <li>• GI RAMS – payment likely. And as this is over 50 units of accommodation, open space.</li> <li>• BNG – on site or off-site mitigation.</li> <li>• Would require a trenched archaeological evaluation, comprising 5% sample of the proposed redline area along with appropriate palaeo-environmental sampling strategy is undertaken to inform on the archaeological potential of the sites and decisions on the need for further archaeological work before the commencement of development will be made on the results of the evaluation.</li> <li>• Due to the presence of substantial WW2 features SCCAS would strongly recommend a UXO survey of the sites are undertaken prior to the required archaeological works commencing.</li> <li>• Capacity of rail bridge to accommodate more traffic, including construction traffic, unknown.</li> <li>• Concerns about setting of Ivy Farm.</li> <li>• Development would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity.</li> <li>• Some impact on education</li> <li>• Consider dwellings near to a railway and amenity impacts.</li> <li>• Traffic impacts will need to be considered through a suitable Transport Statement.</li> <li>• Hedge bordering the track is likely to need to be removed in its entirety to accommodate an access road and footway.</li> <li>• Located in settlement fringe landscape character area – this cannot be overcome.</li> <li>• Concerns about changing the character of the area – this cannot be overcome.</li> <li>• Require the developer to demonstrate that that there is capacity available in the sewerage network to accommodate wastewater flows from the site.</li> <li>• There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road.</li> <li>• Amenity impacts of railway</li> </ul>	


	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure footpath is considered and access maintained.</li> <li>• Railway bridge is narrow when compared to access to existing dwellings near to Tesco.</li> <li>• Mature hedgerow at risk in order to accommodate road and footway.</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 1 year to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settlement fringe area.</li> <li>• Changing character of the area.</li> <li>• Assessment required regarding capacity of bridge to accommodate more traffic and construction traffic.</li> <li>• Development would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity.</li> <li>• Setting of Ivy Farm</li> <li>• Mature hedgerow at risk in order to accommodate road and footway.</li> </ul> <p>Concern re impact on mature trees on site.</p>
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for residential development.	

## 5. Land at Home Farm, The Street, Thurne

### 5.1. Map of site

Call for sites - December 2024

Land at Home Farm, The Street, Thurne



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

## 5.2. Photos of site



Showing the hard standing and barn.



Showing the hard standing and field.



Showing the field and old water pump.

## 5.3. Stakeholder comments

Stakeholder	Comments
Broads Authority Development Management Team	I dealt with two applications at the adjacent site (immediate NW) which was called Home Farm Barns (BA/2020/0103/FUL and BA/2023/0377/FUL), both refused for various reasons, the one pertinent to this proposed site being the unsustainable location. Thurne is really poorly connected and does not have a range of local services. I do not see how this site could be compliant with local or national policy, I would not expect that we could support it.
Broads Authority Heritage and Design	The site is part of a wider farmstead and as such it would be preferable if a more holistic, rather than piecemeal approach could be taken to the wider site. As well as ensuring a more consistent design approach, this would also be beneficial in terms of access etc. There have been previous applications on the adjoining site, covering the farm buildings, including application BA/2023/0377/FUL and BA/2020/0130/FUL both of which were refused.

Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>The site is located in the centre of the attractive village of Thurne. Historic maps suggest that the oldest buildings on the wider farmstead site date from the 18<sup>th</sup> century, with others dating from the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is a site of some historic significance, and the historic buildings would be considered locally identified heritage assets. The barns on the site in question are of relatively modern construction and are not of any architectural or historic significance.</p> <p>In terms of heritage, there may be potential for one or two dwellings, but these should be designed to be in keeping with the character of the site, so that they relate to the wider farmstead setting rather than appearing separate to it and boundary treatment to the east would need to be soft landscaped, as opposed to fencing.</p>
Thurne Parish Council	<p>Thurne is a small village with poor connectivity to the surrounding area, inadequate public transport, and apart from a public house and seasonal gift shop no local services or facilities. The site is not in a sustainable location and the use of private vehicles would be required for all basic day to day, and general needs. The proposal is therefore contrary to Criterion i) of the Local Plan for the Broads (2019), and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).</p> <p>The area where the access track (for the proposed 3 houses) comes out onto The Street is a very busy part of Thurne:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visitors' park both on the road and in an area to the north</li> <li>• 'The Street' floods during high tides</li> <li>• Boats are coming to and from and being launched at the slipway</li> <li>• Visitors are using the public toilets</li> <li>• Ramblers are walking the Weaver's Way</li> <li>• There is Heavy Agricultural traffic going to and from arable land up the track and through Home Farm</li> <li>• Caravans are going to and from Home Farm site.</li> </ul> <p>Thurne Parish Council wish to be advised of the Highways consultation as a minimum, there is a very narrow lane to the village and no public transport with approximately 60 properties in the village the Hedera site will increase the occupation in the village by more than 16% the Parish Council would not approve of any further development of scale without the issues of access being considered and recommendations in place to deal with the impact.</p> <p>Thurne has significant flood issues around the dykes in the village and the Parish Council has significant concerns that until the ongoing development (Hedera House) is completed the impact on these systems will be unknown.</p> <p>As mentioned above the Hedera site adjacent to this area will have an additional 10 properties for a village the size of Thurne this is a significant increase without</p>



Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>improved infrastructure we would not be supportive of any additional area developments without a clear plan to address these issues and a full understanding of the impact once these properties are completed.</p> <p>The Parish Council wish to declare their opposition to this site being included within the call for sites or allocated for development.</p>
Norfolk County Council Heritage	<p>Based on currently available information the above-mentioned application would not have any significant impacts on the Historic Environment in terms of below-ground archaeology.</p> <p>If this site was to come forward as a planning application, we would not recommend conditions for archaeological work. It would be green in a RAG assessment.</p>
Norfolk County Council Education	<p>This size and scale of housing is not likely to impact the existing local school based on the current forecast detail available.</p>
Broads Authority Landscape Architect	<p>The suggested site seems relatively well contained within an existing field boundary, as part of a series of small parcels outside of the main larger field pattern. There are a number of PROW that run through the surrounding farmland, this would need to be a consideration if the site were to be put forward for development as there are many locations where the site could be visible. The relationship between the Church and wider landscape also need consideration, as the introduction of additional built form on The Street could change the visibility and setting of the church.</p>
Norfolk County Council Highways	<p>No objection subject to creation of a suitable access with appropriate visibility. Acknowledge the similarities between the Halvergate site and the Thurne site. The Thurne site would be reliant on an existing access (subject to appropriate visibility being achieved), it is more central to the settlement and nearby to the limited facilities within the village.</p>
Norfolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority.	<p><b>Any future planning application for residential development of this site likely to be a minor due to its scale and fall outside of the LLFA remit / consultation thresholds.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of the site (where any dwellings are likely to be situated) is located within Flood Zone 1 but Flood Zones 2 and 3 lie directly to the west and would affect access to the site.</li> <li>• No on-site foul or surface water sewers.</li> <li>• Not located within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ).</li> <li>• No flood records on-site or within 500m.</li> <li>• On-site: Surface water ponding / pooling within 0.1% and 1% AEP events present on site access (The Street) with surface water flowpaths and areas of surface water ponding / pooling in all three AEP events within 500m. The LLFA</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>consider that there is potential for the presence of the surface water ponding / pooling to impact upon access into the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of the site (approximately half) and its access lies within the Broads Internal Drainage Board (IDB).</li> <li>• No onsite watercourses present. However ordinary watercourses (some within the IDB area) and an EA main river lie within the vicinity of the site (within 500m).</li> <li>• <b>LLFA Assessment: Moderate surface water / flooding constraints identified (particularly the fact that the access lies within FZ2/3) which will require further assessment by the Local Planning Authority (AMBER RAG)</b></li> </ul>
Anglian Water Services	<p>This location is not within a WRC catchment and therefore would require a private sewerage treatment solution such as a package treatment plant, subject to the EA general binding rules or permit. Anglian Water is investigating a first-time sewerage scheme opportunity in the vicinity, but nothing is confirmed at this stage.</p> <p>There is a water main located along The Street.</p> <p>There are no AW assets within or adjoining the site.</p>
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Very small village with very few services (classed as a 'Tertiary Village' village in our existing Local Plan). A pub exists (The Lion) which is open Thursday-Sunday, and a gift shop (which is likely to be seasonal).</li> <li>- A limited number of additional facilities are available across other smaller villages such as Repps and Rollesby, however are between 3 and 5km away and on mostly unlit, national speed limit roads and without footways. Bus services are also very infrequent. Public rights of way exists around the site, however these only connect to the surrounding roads which remain unlit and are of national limit grade. Therefore, there is likely to be greater reliance upon the car over other more sustainable modes.</li> <li>- The site falls within the Rollesby Primary School Catchment. The latest pupil roll forecasting we have obtained from NCC indicates that there will remain some capacity at Rollesby Primary School over the next five years when taking into account projected growth.</li> <li>- The main access to the site is within FRZ2</li> </ul>
Broads Authority Ecologist	<p>We are aware that this site has high biodiversity value, with protected species including nesting barn owl a Schedule 1 breeding bird and kestrels (amber listed in birds of conservation) using the site. Slow worm a priority action plan, section 41 species for conservation is also nearby and potentially uses the site. All these species are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.</p> <p>There should be no net loss of Section 41 species or habitats and connecting semi natural habitats should be retained and enhanced.</p>



Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>Any development may have potential impacts on European designated sites, namely the Broadland SPA located less than 500 meters to the Northwest.</p> <p>This site is therefore <u>NOT</u> considered appropriate for development due to the potential for significant impacts on biodiversity. Development would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity.</p>

## 5.4. Site assessment

Planning history:

Application number	Description	Decision	Date
BA/2020/0103/FUL	3 no. barn conversions to dwellings with associated garages, parking & gardens. Demolition of 3 existing barn buildings.	Refused mainly on marketing and lack of key services grounds.	06 Jul 2020
BA/1991/0052/HISTAP	Renewal of planning permission no. 6/88/1385/F for use of a portacabin as a shop	Approve Subject to Conditions	29 Jul 1991
BA/1988/3282/HISTAP	Erection of portacabin for use as shop	Unknown Historical App Decision	24 Sep 1988
BA/2000/0643/HISTAP	Renewal of planning permission no.06/97/0423/BF for use of portacabin as shop	Approve Subject to Conditions	20 Sep 2000
BA/1997/0442/HISTAP	Renewal of planning permission no. 06/94/0655/BF for use of portacabin as shop	Approve Subject to Conditions	24 Jun 1997
BA/1994/0286/HISTAP	Renewal of planning permission 06/91/0609/BF for use of portacabin as shop	Approve Subject to Conditions	01 Sep 1994

Site address: Land at Home Farm, The Street, Thurne	
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.	<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites.</b> <b>A scheme for barn conversions was refused due to lack of marketing and lack of key services and facilities in the area.</b>
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>	<b>0.24 hectares</b>
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>	<b>Greenfield and brownfield</b>
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)	<b>Private</b>
Absolute Constraints Check	
<b>Is the site in a ...</b>	
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>	<b>No (SSSI Impact Zone)</b>
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>	<b>No</b>

<b>Ancient Woodland</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Flood risk zone 3b</b>		<b>No - Flood zone 1 according to SFRA, but access is flood zone 3 and a small part to the west is flood zone 2.</b>
<b>Scheduled Ancient Monument</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Statutory Allotments</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Locally Designated Green Space</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>At risk from Coastal Erosion</b>		<b>No</b>
<i>If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.</i>		
<b>Development Potential</b> (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): <b>3 dwellings.</b>		
<b>Density calculator</b>		<b>12.5 dwellings per hectare</b>
<b>Suitability Assessment</b>		
<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Access to site		There is direct access from the public highway. There is an existing agricultural access which might need to be upgraded to allow an improved access. Suitable visibility required.  Access to site in flood zone 3.
Accessibility to local services and facilities		No key services.
Utilities Capacity		This location is not within a WRC catchment and therefore would require a private sewerage treatment solution such as a package treatment plant, subject to the EA general binding rules or permit.
Utilities Infrastructure		Overhead wires near the site.
Contamination and ground stability		Part is greenfield so likely no concerns. Part is brownfield land but agent says only been used for storage.
Flood Risk		Flood zone 1 according to SFRA, but access is flood zone 3 and a small part to the west is flood zone 2.
Coastal Change		
Market Attractiveness		Other than limited services and facilities nearby, has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>

Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		There may be potential for one or two dwellings, but these should be designed to be in keeping with the character of the site, so that they relate to the wider farmstead setting rather than appearing separate to it and boundary treatment to the east would need to be soft landscaped, as opposed to fencing. There are trees and hedgerow on the southern boundary which would not need to be removed as part of the proposal.
Townscape		
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		This site has high biodiversity value, with protected species including nesting barn owl a Schedule 1 breeding bird and kestrels (amber listed in birds of conservation) using the site. Slow worm a priority action plan, section 41 species for conservation is also nearby and potentially uses the site. All these species are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Development would likely result in a net loss in biodiversity. There are trees and hedgerow on the southern boundary which would not need to be removed as part of the proposal.
Historic Environment		It is a site of some historic significance, and the historic buildings would be considered locally identified heritage assets. Introduction of additional built form on The Street could change the visibility and setting of the church. Old fashioned water pump in field. If this site was to come forward as a planning application we would not recommend conditions for archaeological work.
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		No objection subject to creation of a suitable access with appropriate visibility. Potential concern from Parish Council regarding the cumulative highways impact of this site and the neighbouring site that is being developed for 16 units.
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		There is residential nearby.
<b>Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)</b>		
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Policy reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
None		
<b>Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)</b>		
Is the site being marketed? Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where,	No	

by whom, how much for etc.)		
When might the site be available for development (tick as appropriate)	Immediately	✓
	Within 5 years	✓
	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):		<b>Agent says will take up to 2 years to complete, so 1.5 dwellings per year is presumed.</b>
Comments	<b>Agent says will take up to 2 years to complete.</b>	
<b>Achievability (including viability)</b>		
Comments	Agent says 'The site is owned by NCC County Farms and there are no known abnormal costs to developing the site for housing. If the site were allocated for development, NCC development partners could seek planning permission for housing and construct the new homes within a 1-2 year period'.	
<b>Overcoming Constraints</b>		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to site in flood zone 3.</li> <li>• Creation of a suitable access with appropriate visibility</li> <li>• Potential concern regarding the cumulative highways impact of this site and the neighbouring site that is being developed for 16 units.</li> <li>• No key services.</li> <li>• Would require a private sewerage treatment solution such as a package treatment plant, subject to the EA general binding rules or permit.</li> <li>• Overhead wires near the site.</li> <li>• Designed to be in keeping with the character of the site, so that they relate to the wider farmstead setting rather than appearing separate to it and boundary treatment to the east would need to be soft landscaped, as opposed to fencing.</li> <li>• There are trees and hedgerow on the southern boundary which would not need to be removed as part of the proposal.</li> <li>• This site has high biodiversity value.</li> <li>• There are trees and hedgerow on the southern boundary which would not need to be removed as part of the proposal.</li> <li>• The historic buildings would be considered locally identified heritage assets.</li> <li>• If this site was to come forward as a planning application we would not recommend conditions for archaeological work.</li> <li>• Introduction of additional built form on The Street could change the visibility and setting of the church.</li> <li>• Old fashioned water pump in field.</li> </ul>	


	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitable access with appropriate visibility.</li> <li>• Grade 2 agricultural land.</li> <li>• GI RAMS – payment likely.</li> <li>• BNG – on site or off site mitigation.</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered immediately to 5 years, but taking 2 years to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to services.</li> <li>• Grade 2 agricultural land.</li> <li>• There are trees and hedgerow on the southern boundary which would not need to be removed as part of the proposal.</li> <li>• This site has high biodiversity value.</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for residential development.	

## 6. Land off Hall Lane, Postwick

### 6.1. Map of site

Call for sites - December 2024

Postwick Hall, Hall Lane, Postwick, Norwich, NR13 5HQ



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any



## 6.2. Photos of site



Looking west along Hall Lane – site is on the left.



Showing the site, taken from the north east corner.



Showing the eastern boundary of the site.



Oaks Lane, with the site to the right of the picture.

## 6.3. Stakeholder comments

Stakeholder	Comments
Broads Authority Development	Postwick is not in a sustainable location, it lacks a shop or any basic service. All it appears to have in its favour is that over 1km away is a park and ride. This does not meet local planning policy standards and can only be considered an unsustainable

Stakeholder	Comments
Management Team	<p>location. It may be close to the edge of a city, but the separation is enough to make a private vehicle necessity for residents.</p> <p>On the plus side they are not looking to remove the existing woodland and are seeking to provide additional woodland. However, this would be with a housing development between the two which fragments the habitat. Also the human presence in the centre would lessen its value.</p> <p>There is possible justification for the location of development in terms of it being opposite existing housing, but there could be pressure for further housing to the south and to the west. That being said, this site would distort the compact shape of the existing settlement.</p>
Broads Authority Heritage and Design	<p>The southern part of the site is within an area where cropmarks of medieval and post medieval field systems and a possible undated trackway have been found (see <a href="#">Norfolk HER record</a>) and this may be considered a constraint. Postwick House, which sits opposite the site would also be considered a locally identified heritage asset, the setting of which should be considered.</p> <p>In terms of design, the site is outside the established area of settlement. Although there are a number of dwellings further to the south along Oaks lane, these are situated on the eastern side of the road and the distinction between the built up area to the east and the surrounding landscape to the west is very clear. I would therefore prefer not to see development encroaching on to the western side of the road. It would be out of keeping with the prevailing settlement pattern in the vicinity.</p>
Postwick with Witton Parish Council	<p>After careful consideration of the proposal, the Council would like to outline the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed development has been deemed unacceptable by the Council due to its location -: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The site access is via single lane country roads</li> <li>b. No hard pavements or pedestrian segregation from traffic along single lane roads</li> <li>c. Drainage issues and also crosses a drainage ditch</li> <li>d. Poor visibility at Hall Lane with conflict with heavy plant and farm machinery coupled with the increase in other types of diverse commercial activities at Hall Farm</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. There has been a significant increase in traffic and size of farm vehicles over the last few years which this development will exacerbate. There is still existing planning permission for a nearby wedding venue which, if it recommences, raises significant concerns regarding road safety and congestion.</li> </ol>

Stakeholder	Comments
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The proposed development will disrupt the green corridor down Oaks Lane, necessitating a thorough ecological survey to assess potential impacts on local wildlife both during construction and after.</li> <li>4. There are no community benefits stemming from this proposal, which raises concerns about its alignment with the interests of existing residents.</li> <li>5. The rural character of our village is at risk of being compromised. Given the location's prominence and elevation, it is crucial to maintain green space and rural access, especially in the countryside.</li> <li>6. Considerable housing growth has already occurred in our parish (more than 200%); therefore, there is an urgent need to explore options for the Broads Authority's 58 houses in more suitable locations.</li> <li>7. Discussions have highlighted the Broadland flood risk, making this proposal inappropriate until outstanding concerns are adequately addressed.</li> <li>8. Concerns regarding flood risk especially given the experience of the previous development and the inadequacy of drainage ditches etc – flooding issues still not fully addressed with the dwellings and road still occurring.</li> <li>9. It should be noted that while the proposed site is not designated as ecological land, it does possess ecological value that should not be overlooked.</li> <li>10. An independent assessment carried out as part of the Neighbourhood Plan has indicated an 'amber' rating for the site; points from this assessment can be shared for further consideration.</li> <li>11. There is also discussion surrounding whether the proposed development focuses solely on social housing, which must be clarified to understand its impact fully.</li> <li>12. The Council also wants to highlight that the existing permissive pathways on the site plans (some of which are shingle) should not be labelled as a public cycle route or walkway.</li> <li>13. The development is in conflict with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan of which the draft has been recently submitted.</li> </ol>
Norfolk County Council Heritage	Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching. Rated amber.
Norfolk County Council Education	<p><b>General Comments, on sites of less than 20 proposed dwellings</b></p> <p>The other sites are deemed suitable to support the existing schools the communities serve and will promote and support the sustainability of the schools in close proximity. Consideration of the impact on walking and cycle routes should be achieved in order to support sustainable modes of transport and reduce families using their motor car where possible.</p>
Broads Authority	I have reviewed this site for 5 residential dwellings, I wouldn't be keen on this due to potential landscape impact, I can see from the plan attached that the suggested

Stakeholder	Comments
Landscape Architect	access would be off Hall Lane and that the development would be somewhat surrounded by new woodland planting. However, I don't think this sits well with the landscape context, and although this could be around potential direct impact on the existing trees and hedgerows, it would create a somewhat isolated development that wouldn't relate in anyway to the existing development pattern.
Norfolk County Council Highways	Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. The highway network is not of a standard to support further development.
Norfolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority.	<p><b>Any future planning application for residential development of this site likely to be a minor due to its scale and fall outside of the LLFA remit / consultation thresholds.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site located within Flood Zone 1 but close to Flood Zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>• Adjacent to foul water sewers.</li> <li>• Located within a Source Protection Zone 2 (SPZ).</li> <li>• No flood records on-site or within 500m.</li> <li>• On-site: Surface water flowpath within all three AEP events present where site access likely with areas of surface water ponding / pooling and flowpaths in all three AEP events within 500m of the proposed site.</li> <li>• Site not within but in close vicinity to the Broads Internal Drainage Board (IDB).</li> <li>• No onsite watercourses or any off-site within the vicinity of the site (within 500m).</li> <li>• <b>LLFA Assessment: Moderate surface water / flooding constraints identified (which will require further assessment by the Local Planning Authority (AMBER RAG))</b></li> </ul>
Anglian Water Services	<p>This site is within the catchment for Whitlingham WRC. There is a growth scheme to increase dry weather flow headroom in AMP8 (2025-30) at Whitlingham identified in our Business Plan – we received final determination of our plan by Ofwat on 19 December 2024 – the date for Anglian Water's formal response to the determination is 18<sup>th</sup> February 2025. Factoring in existing commitments, there is no available headroom at the WRC until the growth scheme is delivered and we would recommend a pre-occupancy clause is attached to any grant of permission to ensure development is not occupied until this time.</p> <p>There are AW assets within and adjoining the site. A rising main is located within the eastern boundary of the site. A water main and sewer adjoining the eastern boundary and sewer to the northern boundary. There are easements for many of our underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.</p>

Stakeholder	Comments
Broads Authority Ecologist	<p>From aerial photographs the proposed development site appears to be an area of undeveloped marsh (needs confirming), therefore there would be a loss of priority habitat and associated species.</p> <p>The area is within the Yare Broads and Marshes SSSI impact zone.</p> <p>Potential nutrient issues affecting Postwick marshes network of ditches in close vicinity if housing not on mains sewage.</p> <p>Existing hedgerows, trees and woodlands should be conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>There should be no net loss of priority habitats, therefore we do not support this site being developed for housing.</p>

## 6.4. Site assessment

Site address: Land off Hall Lane, Postwick		
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.		<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites.</b> <b>BA consulted on this as part of potential allocation for Neighbourhood Plan. Also considered as part of emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</b>
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>		<b>0.72 hectares</b>
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>		<b>Greenfield – arable</b>
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)		<b>Private</b>
<b>Absolute Constraints Check</b>		
<b>Is the site in a ...</b>		
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>		<b>No (SSSI Impact Zone)</b>
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Flood risk zone 3b</b>		<b>No - Flood zone 1 according to SFRA</b>
<b>Scheduled Ancient Monument</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Statutory Allotments</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Locally Designated Green Space</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>At risk from Coastal Erosion</b>		<b>No</b>
<i>If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.</i>		
<b>Development Potential</b> (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): <b>5 dwellings.</b>		
<b>Density calculator</b>		<b>6.9 dwellings per hectare</b>
<b>Suitability Assessment</b>		
<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Score</b> red/amber/green	<b>Comments</b>



Access to site		<p>Poor visibility at Hall Lane with potential for conflict with heavy plant and farm machinery coupled with the increase in other types of diverse commercial activities at Hall Farm.</p> <p>There is still existing planning permission for a nearby wedding venue which, if it recommences, raises significant concerns regarding road safety and congestion.</p> <p>Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. The highway network is not of a standard to support further development.</p>
Accessibility to local services and facilities		1.3km to the Postwick Park and Ride. No other key services in the village.
Utilities Capacity		Factoring in existing commitments, there is no available headroom at the WRC until the growth scheme is delivered and we would recommend a pre-occupancy clause is attached to any grant of permission to ensure development is not occupied until this time.
Utilities Infrastructure		<p>There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road.</p> <p>There are AW assets within and adjoining the site. A rising main is located within the eastern boundary of the site. A water main and sewer adjoining the eastern boundary and sewer to the northern boundary. There are easements for many of our underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.</p> <p>HSE pipeline consultation zone. Outer zone from gas pipe to/from Bacton terminal.</p>
Contamination and ground stability		
Flood Risk		In flood zone 1, but some elements of surface water flood risk along the eastern boundary. Drainage ditch nearby.
Coastal Change		
Market Attractiveness		Other than limited services and facilities nearby, has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads



Impact	Score red/amber/green	Comments
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		Mature trees and hedges. There could be pressure for further housing to the south and to the west.
Townscape		This site would distort the compact shape of the existing settlement. I would therefore prefer not to see development encroaching on to the western side of the road. It would be out of keeping with the prevailing settlement pattern in the vicinity. Does not sit well with the landscape context, and although this could be around potential direct impact on the existing trees and hedgerows, it would create a somewhat isolated development that wouldn't relate in any way to the existing development pattern. Existing hedgerows, trees and woodlands should be conserved and enhanced.
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		The housing development could fragment the habitat. Existing hedgerows, trees and woodlands should be conserved and enhanced. Potential loss of priority habitat and associated species.
Historic Environment		The southern part of the site is within an area where cropmarks of medieval and post medieval field systems and a possible undated trackway have been found (see <a href="#">Norfolk HER record</a> ) and this may be considered a constraint. Postwick House, which sits opposite the site would also be considered a locally identified heritage asset, the setting of which should be considered. Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. The highway network is not of a standard to support further development.
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		
<b>Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)</b>		
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Policy reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
None		
<b>Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)</b>		
Is the site being marketed?	No	


Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where, by whom, how much for etc.)		
When might the site be available for development (tick as appropriate)	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	✓
	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):	<b>Agent says will take up to 1 years to complete, so 5 dwellings per year is presumed.</b>	
Comments	<b>Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete.</b>	
<b>Achievability (including viability)</b>		
Comments	Agent says 'The proposer is the landowner (or the owner of Postwick Hall Farm) and he is willing to make the plot available as soon as possible after any harvesting of the crop on the arable part of the site. His business would build-out the site and he is a very experienced small developer. He believes that there is a strong demand for the units being proposed as there is a great need for modest dwellings and for single storey. There are no particular physical constraints on the site itself'.	
<b>Overcoming Constraints</b>		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor visibility at Hall Lane with potential for conflict with heavy plant and farm machinery coupled with the increase in other types of diverse commercial activities at Hall Farm.</li> <li>• There is still existing planning permission for a nearby wedding venue which, if it recommences, raises significant concerns regarding road safety and congestion.</li> <li>• Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. The highway network is not of a standard to support further development.</li> <li>• Lack of key services</li> <li>• Factoring in existing commitments, there is no available headroom at the WRC until the growth scheme is delivered and we would recommend a pre-occupancy clause is attached to any grant of permission to ensure development is not occupied until this time.</li> <li>• Cables overhead</li> <li>• Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching</li> <li>• There are AW assets within and adjoining the site</li> <li>• HSE pipeline consultation zone. Outer zone from gas pipe to/from Bacton terminal.</li> <li>• Consider drainage ditch</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some surface water</li> <li>• Does not sit well with the landscape context,</li> <li>• Existing hedgerows, trees and woodlands should be conserved and enhanced.</li> <li>• Potential loss of priority habitat and associated species.</li> <li>• Cropmarks of medieval and post medieval field systems</li> <li>• Locally identified heritage asset.</li> <li>• Highways objection.</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 1 year to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	Access to services. Highways objection. Landscape impact.
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for residential development.	

## 7. Land north of Marsh Road, Tunstall

### 7.1. Map of site

Call for sites - December 2024  
Land north of Marsh Road, Tunstall



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.



## 7.2. Photos of site



Looking north, showing the site from site entrance.



Church on the west boundary of the site.



Looking east along the road.



Entrance to the site from the road.

## 7.3. Stakeholder comments

Stakeholder	Comments
Broads Authority Development Management Team	<p>This is not a sustainable location and meets no basic requirement in terms of accessibility and services.</p> <p>Tunstall Road is a narrow and without any formal passing places, so access is poor.</p> <p>The agricultural land is Grade 2 and should be protected.</p> <p>I do not see how we support development at this location</p>
Broads Authority	<p>The site sits immediately adjacent to the Halvergate and Tunstall Conservation Area on three sides. It is also directly adjacent to the grade II* listed church of St Peter and St Paul, as well as being in close proximity to locally listed</p>

Stakeholder	Comments
Heritage and Design	<p>structures such as the K6 telephone kiosk opposite. The setting of these designated and non-designated heritage assets would need to be considered. Although no finds are identified on the site (on the Norfolk HER), it would be reasonable to assume that the site could be of archaeological interest (it may be worth checking with the County?).</p> <p>Officers would have great concerns regarding the proposal for the development of three dwellings on this site. There are key views of the church from the east and the relatively isolated setting of the church is considered to contribute to its significance. This would be eroded with residential development on the proposed site.</p>
Halvergate Parish Council	Regarding the two sites put forward in Tunstall, Halvergate and Tunstall parish council are supportive of including both sites in the Broads Authority's proposed development plan. The council has specific comments/conditions, but it understands these can be addressed if and when a planning application is submitted.
Norfolk County Council Heritage	Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching. Rated amber.
Norfolk County Council Education	<p><b>General Comments, on sites of less than 20 proposed dwellings</b></p> <p>The other sites are deemed suitable to support the existing schools the communities serve and will promote and support the sustainability of the schools in close proximity. Consideration of the impact on walking and cycle routes should be achieved in order to support sustainable modes of transport and reduce families using their motor car where possible.</p>
Broads Authority Landscape Architect	I have reviewed this site for 3 residential dwellings. I can see there could be some logic in 'annexing' the southern end of the field, and this would unlikely have significant overall impacts on the wider field pattern. However, the main sensitivities here are the proximity to the church and its landscape setting (which is not only a heritage issue but a landscape one too) and that of PROW in the vicinity which would be impacted by any development in this location, due to the current level of openness of the landscape. I don't believe this location could accommodate development without negative/adverse impacts on both the landscape setting associated with the church (and physical landscape features such as large mature trees), and views from long distance footpaths (Halvergate FP1 in particular). I therefore wouldn't support the inclusion of this site.
Norfolk County Council Highways	Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. The highway network is not of a standard to support further development.



Stakeholder	Comments
Norfolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority.	<p><b>Any future planning application for residential development of this site likely to be a minor due to its scale and fall outside of the LLFA remit / consultation thresholds.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site located within Flood Zone 1.</li> <li>• No on-site foul or surface water sewers.</li> <li>• Not located within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ).</li> <li>• No flood records on-site or within 500m.</li> <li>• On-site: Small area of surface water ponding / pooling within 0.1% AEP event present Off-site: Small areas of surface water ponding / pooling in all three AEP events within 500m. Small ponds also showing within vicinity of site on mapping.</li> <li>• Site not located within the Broads Internal Drainage Board (IDB).</li> <li>• No onsite watercourses or any off-site within the vicinity of the site (within 500m).</li> <li>• <b>LLFA Assessment: No major surface water issues / constraints identified (Green RAG)</b></li> </ul>
Anglian Water Services	<p>This location is not within a WRC catchment and therefore would require a private sewerage treatment solution such as a package treatment plant, subject to the EA's general binding rules or permit.</p> <p>There is a water main adjoining the southern boundary of the site, as our underground assets are often located in roadside verges. There are easements for many of our underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.</p>
Broads Authority Ecologist	<p>A Habitats Regulation Assessment will apply due to potential impacts of the proposal on European designated sites, namely the Broadland SPA located some 600m to the East of the proposed development.</p> <p>Ecological assessments will be required to assess the impact of sites on habitats and species, and to help mitigate potential impacts of the development proposal.</p> <p>From the information provided the site appears to be currently in arable production.</p> <p>Existing hedgerows and trees should be retained and enhanced.</p> <p>We would expect Biodiversity net gain to be implemented on site within this sensitive locality close to the Broads European designated SAC and SPA. Biodiversity enhancements including tree and hedgerow planting should be incorporated into the proposal to improve habitat connectivity and provide wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Some localised increase in recreational disturbance to designated sites.</p>

## 7.4. Site assessment

Site address: Land north of Marsh Road, Tunstall		
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.	<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites.</b>	
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>	<b>0.47 hectares</b>	
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>	<b>Greenfield – arable</b>	
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)	<b>Private</b>	
<b>Absolute Constraints Check</b>		
<b>Is the site in a ...</b>		
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>	<b>No (SSSI Impact Zone)</b>	
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Flood risk zone 3b</b>	<b>No - Flood zone 1 according to SFRA</b>	
<b>Scheduled Ancient Monument</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Statutory Allotments</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Locally Designated Green Space</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>At risk from Coastal Erosion</b>	<b>No</b>	
<i>If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.</i>		
<b>Development Potential</b> (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): <b>3 dwellings.</b>		
<b>Density calculator</b>	<b>6.38 dwellings per hectare</b>	
<b>Suitability Assessment</b>		
<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Access to site		Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. The highway network is not of a standard to support further development. Tunstall Road is a narrow and without any formal passing places, so access is poor.
Accessibility to local services and facilities		1.3km to bus stop. Country roads with no footways. No other key services nearby.
Utilities Capacity		This location is not within a WRC catchment and therefore would require a private sewerage treatment solution such as a package treatment plant, subject to the EA's general binding rules or permit.
Utilities Infrastructure		There are easements for many of Anglian water underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that

		maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary. Overhead lines at northern edge of site.
Contamination and ground stability		
Flood Risk		In flood zone 1, but some elements of surface water flood risk on site.
Coastal Change		
Market Attractiveness		Other than limited services and facilities nearby, has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		Do not believe this location could accommodate development without negative/adverse impacts on both the landscape setting associated with the church (and physical landscape features such as large mature trees), and views from long distance footpaths (Halvergate FP1 in particular).
Townscape		
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		Existing hedgerows and trees should be retained and enhanced. Some localised increase in recreational disturbance to designated sites.
Historic Environment		Listed church to the west of the site. There are key views of the church from the east and the relatively isolated setting of the church is considered to contribute to its significance. This would be eroded with residential development on the proposed site. Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching.
Open Space		
Access to site		Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. The highway network is not of a standard to support further development.
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		Other than the church the neighbouring uses are residential and agricultural.
<b>Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)</b>		
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Policy reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
None		
<b>Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)</b>		
Is the site being marketed? Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where,	No	


by whom, how much for etc.)		
When might the site be available for development (tick as appropriate)	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	✓
	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):		<b>Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete, so 3 dwellings per year is presumed.</b>
Comments	<b>Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete.</b>	
<b>Achievability (including viability)</b>		
Comments	Agent says 'We do not anticipate any abnormal constraints on the site. The site is in a good location that would be attractive to potential purchasers. The development of the site would form a natural infill to this part of the settlement. The site is available now and deliverable within the next 1 to 2 years'.	
<b>Overcoming Constraints</b>		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The agricultural land is Grade 2 and should be protected.</li> <li>• Highway Objection to the proposed allocation.</li> <li>• No key services.</li> <li>• Would require a private sewerage treatment solution such as a package treatment plant</li> <li>• There are easements for many of Anglian Water underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.</li> <li>• Overhead lines at northern edge of site.</li> <li>• Some elements of surface water flood risk on site.</li> <li>• Negative/adverse impacts on both the landscape setting associated with the church (and physical landscape features such as large mature trees), and views from long distance footpaths (Halvergate FP1 in particular).</li> <li>• Existing hedgerows and trees should be retained and enhanced.</li> <li>• There are key views of the church from the east and the relatively isolated setting of the church is considered to contribute to its significance. This would be eroded with residential development on the proposed site.</li> <li>• Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching.</li> <li>• GI RAMS – payment likely.</li> <li>• BNG – on site or off-site mitigation.</li> </ul>	
<b>Trajectory of development</b>		

Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 1 year to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highway Objection to the proposed allocation.</li> <li>• No key services.</li> <li>• Negative impact on landscape character.</li> <li>• Negative impact on church and setting.</li> <li>• Grade 2 agricultural land</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for residential development.	

## 8. Land south of Marsh Road, Tunstall

### 8.1. Map of site

Call for sites - December 2024  
Land south of Marsh Road, Tunstall



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any



## 8.2. Photos of site



Access to the site from the road.



The track to the buildings and some farm buildings



Looking north back towards the road from the farm.



Looking towards farm buildings to the west.



The north east corner, looking south west.



Open part of the site, just along the track from the road.





Buildings to the west of the site.



Wooden border of the site with the road.

### 8.3. Stakeholder comments

Stakeholder	Comments
Broads Authority Development Management Team	<p>This is not a sustainable location and meets no basic requirement in terms of accessibility and services.</p> <p>Tunstall Road is a narrow and without any formal passing places, so access is poor.</p> <p>This is a farm site surrounded by farmland. Is this site now redundant or will they be needing new agricultural buildings elsewhere?</p> <p>There is potential harm to the setting of a listed building.</p> <p>I do not see how we support development at this location.</p>
Broads Authority Heritage and Design	<p>The site sits within the Halvergate and Tunstall Conservation Area and is a farmyard which was historically likely to have been associated with the adjoining grade II listed Hall Farm House (now known as Tunstall Hall). It is located to the south of the grade II* listed Church of St Peter and St Paul. The boundary wall between the site and Tunstall Hall to the west is curtilage listed and the single storey barn in the south-west corner of the site is on the Broads Authority's Local List (photo 8599).</p> <p>Given the site's location within the conservation area and in proximity to a number of other designated heritage assets, I would suggest that any development would have to be carefully designed and should include the retention of the locally listed barn (potentially its sympathetic conversion) and preferably the retention and conversion of the other 19<sup>th</sup> century barns that run almost north-south to the west of the site (in photo 8596) and also contribute to the character of the conservation area, relate to the historic use of the listed Tunstall Hall (Hall Farm) – thereby contributing to its significance and the wider farming heritage of the village.</p>

Stakeholder	Comments
Halvergate Parish Council	<p>Regarding the two sites put forward in Tunstall, Halvergate and Tunstall parish council are supportive of including both sites in the Broads Authority's proposed development plan.</p> <p>The council has specific comments/conditions, but it understands these can be addressed if and when a planning application is submitted.</p>
Norfolk County Council Heritage	Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching. Amber rating.
Norfolk County Council Education	<p><b>General Comments, on sites of less than 20 proposed dwellings</b></p> <p>The other sites are deemed suitable to support the existing schools the communities serve and will promote and support the sustainability of the schools in close proximity. Consideration of the impact on walking and cycle routes should be achieved in order to support sustainable modes of transport and reduce families using their motor car where possible.</p>
Broads Authority Landscape Architect	<p>In terms of the land to the south, it appears this is far less sensitive, in terms of the proximity to the setting of the church and PROW. Though there are a number of physical landscape features such as trees and possibly hedgerows that would warrant protection, it appears that this location could accommodate some development without negative/adverse impacts.</p> <p>If allocated, the height of any development and layout would need to be key considerations to ensure any development would read as a small group of buildings (similar to that of farm buildings etc) rather than a block of housing, in particular as viewed from Halvergate FP11. The overall sensitivity of this footpath is likely to be less than those to the north, as this connects through fields between the hamlet at Tunstall and larger settlement at Halvergate and is far less isolated. However, any visual impact would still need to be carefully considered and managed through the appropriate placement of built form, careful consideration of boundary treatments etc and the use of well placed trees or landscape measures to help assimilate any development into the location.</p>
Norfolk County Council Highways	Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. The highway network is not of a standard to support further development.
Norfolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority.	<p><b>Any future planning application for residential development of this site likely to be a minor due to its scale and fall outside of the LLFA remit / consultation thresholds.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site located within Flood Zone 1.</li> <li>• No on-site foul or surface water sewers.</li> <li>• Not located within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ).</li> <li>• No flood records on-site or within 500m.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On-site: Small area of surface water ponding / pooling within 0.1% AEP event present. Off-site: Small areas of surface water ponding / pooling in all three AEP events within 500m. Small pond also showing on site on mapping.</li> <li>Site not located within the Broads Internal Drainage Board (IDB).</li> <li>No onsite watercourses or any off-site within the vicinity of the site (within 500m).</li> <li><b>LLFA Assessment: No major surface water issues / constraints identified (Green RAG)</b></li> </ul>
Anglian Water Services	This location is not within a WRC catchment and therefore would require a private sewerage treatment solution such as a package treatment plant, subject to the EA's general binding rules or permit.
Broads Authority Ecologist	<p>The site appears to be an existing farm, with buildings potentially supporting protected species such as bats and barn owls. The site would provide excellent access for these species to the wider countryside for feeding and breeding opportunities.</p> <p>There are mature trees and hedgerows on site, which can support nesting birds as well as bat roosts, and feeding and commuting networks for bats</p> <p>Due to the high likelihood of protected species using this site, and the importance of retaining historic roost / nesting sites we do not support this site for future development.</p>

## 8.4. Site assessment

Site address: Land south of Marsh Road, Tunstall	
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.	<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites.</b>
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>	<b>0.74 hectares</b>
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>	<b>Brownfield and greenfield. Agent says the barns would be converted: 'Conversion of existing barns to residential use. There are a number of barns, both modern and traditional. It would be the aim to convert the traditional barns for residential use'.</b>
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)	<b>Private</b>
Absolute Constraints Check	
Is the site in a ...	
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>	<b>No (SSSI Impact Zone)</b>
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>	<b>No</b>

<b>Ancient Woodland</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Flood risk zone 3b</b>		<b>No - Flood zone 1 according to SFRA</b>
<b>Scheduled Ancient Monument</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Statutory Allotments</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Locally Designated Green Space</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>At risk from Coastal Erosion</b>		<b>No</b>
<i>If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.</i>		
<b>Development Potential</b> (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): <b>4 dwellings.</b>		
<b>Density calculator</b>		<b>5.4 dwellings per hectare</b>
<b>Suitability Assessment</b>		
<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Access to site		Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. The highway network is not of a standard to support further development. Tunstall Road is a narrow and without any formal passing places, so access is poor. Public footpath to east of the site.
Accessibility to local services and facilities		1.3km to bus stop. Country roads with no footways. No other key services nearby.
Utilities Capacity		This location is not within a WRC catchment and therefore would require a private sewerage treatment solution such as a package treatment plant, subject to the EA's general binding rules or permit.
Utilities Infrastructure		There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road.
Contamination and ground stability		Agent says: 'The ground conditions are stable and there are no known contamination or potential contamination issues on the site'.
Flood Risk		In flood zone 1.
Coastal Change		
Market Attractiveness		Other than limited services and facilities nearby, has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		There are a number of physical landscape features such as trees and possibly hedgerows that would warrant protection. It appears that this location could accommodate some development without negative/adverse impacts. The height of any development and layout would need to be key
Townscape		

		considerations to ensure any development would read as a small group of buildings (similar to that of farm buildings etc) rather than a block of housing, in particular as viewed from Halvergate FP11. Any visual impact would still need to be carefully considered and managed through the appropriate placement of built form, careful consideration of boundary treatments etc and the use of well-placed trees or landscape measures to help assimilate any development into the location.
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		Area of woodland. The site appears to be an existing farm, with buildings potentially supporting protected species such as bats and barn owls. The site would provide excellent access for these species to the wider countryside for feeding and breeding opportunities. There are mature trees and hedgerows on site, which can support nesting birds as well as bat roosts, and feeding and commuting networks for bats.
Historic Environment		The site sits within the Halvergate and Tunstall Conservation Area and is a farmyard which was historically likely to have been associated with the adjoining grade II listed Hall Farm House (now known as Tunstall Hall). It is located to the south of the grade II* listed Church of St Peter and St Paul. Given the site's location within the conservation area and in proximity to a number of other designated heritage assets, any development would have to be carefully designed and should include the retention of the locally listed barn (potentially its sympathetic conversion) and preferably the retention and conversion of the other 19 <sup>th</sup> century barns that run almost north-south to the west of the site (in photo 8596) and also contribute to the character of the conservation area, relate to the historic use of the listed Tunstall Hall (Hall Farm). Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching.
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. The highway network is not of a standard to support further development. Tunstall Road is a narrow and without any formal passing places, so access is poor. Public footpath to east of the site.
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		



Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)		
Designation	Policy reference	Comments
None		
Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)		
Is the site being marketed? Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where, by whom, how much for etc.)	No	
When might the site be available for development (tick as appropriate)	Immediately	✓
	Within 5 years	✓
	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):		Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete, so 5 dwellings per year is presumed.
Comments	Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete.	
Achievability (including viability)		
Comments	Agent says 'There are no abnormal constraints that would impact the delivery of the site. The site is in single ownership and available for gaining planning permission now and development in the short term. The dwellings would be attractive to the market, being of a design appropriate for the surroundings and appealing to a buyer looking for this sort of property'.	
Overcoming Constraints		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highway Objection to the proposed allocation</li> <li>• Tunstall Road is a narrow and without any formal passing places, so access is poor.</li> <li>• Public footpath to east of the site.</li> <li>• No key services.</li> <li>• This location is not within a WRC catchment and therefore would require a private sewerage treatment solution such as a package treatment plant, subject to the EA's general binding rules or permit.</li> <li>• There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road.</li> <li>• There are a number of physical landscape features such as trees and possibly hedgerows that would warrant protection.</li> <li>• Any visual impact would still need to be carefully considered and managed through the appropriate placement of built form, careful consideration of boundary treatments etc and the use of well-placed trees or landscape measures to help assimilate any development into the location.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site would provide excellent access for bats and barn owls to the wider countryside for feeding and breeding opportunities.</li> <li>• Located within the conservation area and in proximity to a number of other designated heritage assets, any development would have to be carefully designed and should include the retention of the locally listed barn</li> <li>• Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching.</li> <li>• GI RAMS – payment likely.</li> <li>• BNG – on site or off site mitigation.</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 1 year to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highway Objection to the proposed allocation.</li> <li>• No key services.</li> <li>• Grade 2 agricultural land.</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for residential development.	

## 9. Land at Broad Lane, Filby

### 9.1. Map of site

Call for sites - December 2024  
Broad Lane Filby nr293HH



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright (and database rights) 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.



## 9.2. Photos of site



Looking to the north



Looking west along Broad Lane



Showing access onto the site



Showing the eastern boundary





Looking towards the southwest corner



Looking east along Broad Lane

### 9.3. Stakeholder comments

Stakeholder	Comments
Broads Authority Development Management Team	About two thirds of the site is in flood zone 3, and about 90% of the site is in flood zone 2. There may be a small pocket that has development potential in the northwest corner of the site, but otherwise this is a site that is susceptible to flooding and a caution should be exercised in terms of more vulnerable.
Broads Authority Heritage and Design	There are no particular heritage constraints. However, in terms of design, from mapping and aerial photographs it would seem that predominantly development in the immediate vicinity is relatively large, detached properties on substantial plots. I would therefore suggest that four properties may be too much, as a cul-de-sac form of development would be uncharacteristic. I would suggest there may be potential for a maximum of two properties in order for development to be in accordance with both our Local Plan and the Filby Neighbourhood plan, both of which require that development should reflect the prevailing characteristics of the area.
Filby Parish Council	Filby Parish Council supports the site on the basis that the site will only hold two dwellings as affordable houses as it is outside the development boundary; and wish to note that the road is unmade and cannot sustain more dwellings than the proposed two.

Stakeholder	Comments
Norfolk County Council Heritage	Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching. Amber rated.
Norfolk County Council Education	<p><b>General Comments, on sites of less than 20 proposed dwellings</b></p> <p>The other sites are deemed suitable to support the existing schools the communities serve and will promote and support the sustainability of the schools in close proximity. Consideration of the impact on walking and cycle routes should be achieved in order to support sustainable modes of transport and reduce families using their motor car where possible.</p>
Broads Authority Landscape Architect	I wouldn't object to allocation for two dwellings along the frontage, looks like a few trees on the site and some habitat which could be of interest – so boundaries to reflect the protection and/or enhancement of those if would fall within the allocated site area. I doubt there is any visibility from the broad and existing development in area appears to be two storey, so, providing that is along the frontage and not a back to back arrangement there should be an issue - but could put a height restriction on if there is an issue with visibility.
Norfolk County Council Highways	We don't believe adequate visibility from Broad Lane onto the A1064 Main Road is achievable and therefore not appropriate for further development. A 2.4m setback for visibility splays is required which is not achievable to the east due to private hedge. Visibility to the west is likely to be impeded by signage and parking on a regular basis.
Broads Authority Environment advisor	SSSI and SPA next to the site. Would need to mitigate impacts. Nutrient Enrichment and scope for Nutrient Neutrality needs to be considered as there is a history of raw sewage spills from the Filby Café waste water storage tank. Mature trees on site connect to a wildlife corridor. Dark skies over grassland habitat provide bat foraging area that would be destroyed. Deciduous woodland borders site connection to the SSSI. May be on peat rich soil as close to the predicted margin, would need survey to determine where the boundary lies.
Norfolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority.	<p><b>Any future planning application for residential development of this site likely to be a minor due to its scale and fall outside of the LLFA remit / consultation thresholds.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of the site lies within Flood Zone 2 and 3, with only a small area of the site within Flood Zone 1 (north-east corner adjacent to Broad Lane).</li> <li>• No on-site sewers – Foul sewers run along the boundary with Broad Lane and within the vicinity of the site.</li> <li>• Not located within a Source Protection Zone (SPPZ).</li> <li>• No flood records on-site. Off-site: Flood records within 500m.</li> </ul>



Stakeholder	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On-site: No surface water issues identified. Off-site: Surface water flow paths and ponding and pooling in 0.1%, 1% and 3.33% AEP events within 500m of the site.</li> <li>Site lies within Broads Internal Drainage Board.</li> <li>No onsite watercourses, however ordinary watercourses (some within the IDB area) are located within 100m.</li> <li><b>LLFA Assessment: Whilst no major surface water issues / constraints identified, the majority of the site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and as such will require further assessment by the Local Planning Authority (AMBER RAG)</b></li> </ul>
Essex and Suffolk Water	<p>We do not appear to have any underground assets running through this land, but any future development would need to check this with us. The development site is very close to our land holding – Filby Broad. This is a SSSI and SAC site. As owners we are responsible for the designated features of the site and ensuring they are conserved. As such, any development this close to the protected site should be subject to the relevant environmental checks (for example, HRA) to ensure it would not be detrimental to the features of the site. Particularly relevant would be, how sewage is dealt with because the protected site already has elevated levels of N and P, and light/noise pollution which could affect bird populations. This is not an exhaustive list of considerations.</p>
Anglian Water Services	<p>Anglian Water is the sewerage undertaker for this location. The site is within the Caister-Pump Lane WRC catchment which has dry weather flow headroom to accommodate additional flows from this site.</p> <p>There is a foul sewer along Broad Lane to the northern boundary of the site. There are no AW assets within the site.</p>
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Filby is a small village with a limited range of services and facilities (classed as a ‘Secondary village’ in our existing Local Plan). The site is within close walking distance of the primary school, shop, village hall. A public house is at the furthest extent of the village to the east, approximately 2km away. A number of bus services run along Main Road, very close to the site throughout the day and week. The close proximity of the site to the shop and school helps to reduce reliance upon the car, though access to employment opportunities (which are principally located within more higher order settlements such as Great Yarmouth or Acle are likely to mostly rely upon the car.</li> <li>The site falls within the Filby Primary School catchment. The latest pupil roll forecasting we have obtained from NCC indicates that the school will be over-capacity within the next five year when taking into account projected growth with no room to expand on the site.</li> <li>Over half of the size (along the western half and extending to the south-east corner) is indicatively in flood risk zone 3b. We would usually require further hydraulic modelling of the site to determine the actual level of flood risk.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Comments
Broads Authority Ecologist	<p>From aerial photographs the proposed development site appears to be a large area of undeveloped marsh, therefore there would be a loss of Section 41 priority habitat and associated species.</p> <p>The site is less than 100 metres from Filby Broad, part of the Broads Special Area of Conservation, and within the SSSI impact zone of the Trinity Broads Site of Special Scientific Interest.</p> <p>The potential for nutrient issues to impact the nearby SAC.</p> <p>Existing hedgerows and trees are present on the site, and these should be conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>There should be no net loss of priority Section 41 habitats, therefore we do not support this site being developed.</p>

## 9.4. Site assessment

Planning history:

Application number	Description	Decision	Date
BA/2016/0129/FUL	Replacement of existing jetty with a purpose build jetty of similar size in the same location.	Approve Subject to Conditions	13 May 2016
BA/2021/0017/FUL	Enlargement of existing boat storage building and lean-to workshop.	Approve Subject to Conditions	06 Apr 2021

Site address: Land at Broad Lane, Filby	
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.	<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites.</b> <b>No planning application history for the site.</b>
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>	<b>0.39 hectares</b>
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>	<b>Greenfield.</b>
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)	<b>Private</b>
Absolute Constraints Check	
<b>Is the site in a ...</b>	
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>	<b>No (SSSI Impact Zone)</b>
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Flood risk zone 3b</b>	<b>No – Some flood zone 1, most flood zone 2, indicative flood zone 3b according to SFRA but allocation could reflect this.</b>
<b>Scheduled Ancient Monument</b>	<b>No</b>

Statutory Allotments		No
Locally Designated Green Space		No
At risk from Coastal Erosion		No
If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.		
Development Potential (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): 4 dwellings initially, then 2 dwellings.		
Density calculator		5.13 dwellings per hectare
Suitability Assessment		
Constraint	Score red/amber/green	Comments
Access to site		Lack of visibility splay possible with junction with Main Road. Broad Lane is private access. Broad Lane is un-made.
Accessibility to local services and facilities		The site is within close walking distance of the primary school, shop, bus stop with peak hour services to higher order settlement.
Utilities Capacity		Overhead Lines. There is a foul sewer along Broad Lane to the northern boundary of the site.
Utilities Infrastructure		There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road.
Contamination and ground stability		
Flood Risk		Some flood zone 1, most flood zone 2, indicative flood zone 3b according to SFRA but allocation could reflect this. There may be a small pocket that has development potential in the northwest corner of the site, but otherwise this is a site that is susceptible to flooding and a caution should be exercised in terms of more vulnerable.
Coastal Change		
Market Attractiveness		Other than limited services and facilities nearby, has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads
Impact	Score red/amber/green	Comments
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		May be potential for a maximum of two properties in order for development to be in accordance with both our Local Plan and the Filby Neighbourhood plan, both of which require that development should reflect the prevailing characteristics of the area. Any housing along the frontage and not a back-to-back arrangement. Could put a height restriction on if there is an issue with visibility.
Townscape		

Biodiversity and Geodiversity		<p>SSSI, RAMSAR, SPA and SAC near to the site.</p> <p>The proposed development site appears to be a large area of undeveloped marsh, therefore there would be a loss of Section 41 priority habitat and associated species.</p> <p>Existing hedgerows and trees are present on the site, and these should be conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>May be on peat rich soil as close to the predicted margin, would need survey to determine where the boundary lies.</p> <p>Nutrient Enrichment and scope for Nutrient Neutrality needs to be considered as there is a history of raw sewage spills from the Filby Café wastewater storage tank.</p> <p>Great Crested Newts: Amber zones contain main population centres for GCN and comprise important connecting habitat that aids natural dispersal.</p>
Historic Environment		Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching.
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		Don't believe adequate visibility from Broad Lane onto the A1064 Main Road is achievable and therefore not appropriate for further development.
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		The neighbouring uses are residential and agricultural.
<b>Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)</b>		
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Policy reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
None		
<b>Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)</b>		
Is the site being marketed? Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where, by whom, how much for etc.)	No	
When might the site be available for development (tick as appropriate)	Immediately	✓
	Within 5 years	✓
	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	

Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):	<b>Agent says will take up to 4 years to complete, so ½ a dwelling per year is presumed.</b>
Comments	<b>Agent says will take up to 4 years to complete.</b>
<b>Achievability (including viability)</b>	
Comments	Agent says 'the proposal will be rented providing long term accommodation for young families'.
<b>Overcoming Constraints</b>	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheme would need to consider the woodland on the boundaries and on site.</li> <li>• Lack of visibility splay possible with junction with Main Road.</li> <li>• Overhead Lines.</li> <li>• There is a foul sewer along Broad Lane to the northern boundary of the site.</li> <li>• Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching.</li> <li>• Some flood zone 1, most flood zone 2, indicative flood zone 3b according to SFRA but allocation could reflect this. There may be a small pocket that has development potential in the northwest corner of the site.</li> <li>• Development should reflect the prevailing characteristics of the area. Any housing along the frontage and not a back-to-back arrangement. Could put a height restriction on if there is an issue with visibility.</li> <li>• SSSI, RAMSAR, SPA and SAC near to the site.</li> <li>• The proposed development site appears to be a large area of undeveloped marsh, therefore there would be a loss of Section 41 priority habitat and associated species.</li> <li>• Existing hedgerows and trees are present on the site, and these should be conserved and enhanced.</li> <li>• Great Crested Newt amber zone.</li> <li>• May be on peat rich soil as close to the predicted margin, would need survey to determine where the boundary lies.</li> <li>• Nutrient Enrichment and scope for Nutrient Neutrality needs to be considered as there is a history of raw sewage spills from the Filby Café wastewater storage tank.</li> <li>• GI RAMS – payment likely.</li> <li>• BNG – on site or off site mitigation.</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 4 years to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development site appears to be a large area of undeveloped marsh, therefore there would be a loss of Section 41 priority habitat and associated species.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing hedgerows and trees are present on the site which could be at risk.</li> <li>• May be on peat rich soil as close to the predicted margin, would need survey to determine where the boundary lies.</li> <li>• Lack of visibility splay possible with junction with Main Road.</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for residential development.	




## 10. The Old Boatyard, Whitlingham Lane, Trowse

### 10.1. Map of site

Call for sites - December 2024

The Old Boatyard, Whitlingham Lane, Trowse, NR14 8TR



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.



## 10.2. Photos of site

These photos were taken in January 2025. The site was closed and boats removed.



Showing the old boatyard and one of the accesses.



Taken from the footway along Whitlingham Lane



Showing the old rowing club and part of the boatyard.



Showing both buildings on site.

Please go to the [original HELAA](#) (September 2023) for more photos of the site taken when the boatyard was in operation.

## 10.3. Stakeholder comments

Stakeholder	Comments
Broads Authority Development Management Team	Although appearing to be sited on the edge of Norwich its siting to the south of the River Yare means that there is a critical separation between the two areas, this is not a site that is well linked to the city and certainly does not meet the majority of sustainable location criteria. It may be close to the edge of a city, but the separation is enough to make it a case that we would hope residents would use bicycles and public transport, but I anticipate that a private vehicle, being a necessity for residents, would be the main form of transport used.

Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>On the plus side the site is large enough to accommodate 4 to 6 dwellings, although taking into account the density of residential plot development on this section of Whitlingham Lane, 4 may be more appropriate.</p> <p>The site is reasonably well screened from the Broad but the land does slope down towards the Broad so the siting, scale, and design of any new buildings would have to be well considered. In addition a suitable landscaping scheme could help lessen potential impacts.</p> <p>Until recently the main use of the site was as a boatyard which is within Use Class B2. Such uses are protected in the Local Plan and require a viability assessment and 12 months marketing of the site to demonstrate that employment uses are not viable and there is no interest in the site in its current use. This would need to be satisfied before any change of use is considered.</p> <p>A small part of the site is within flood zone 2 and there is even an area within flood zone 3. Built development should avoid these flood zones.</p>
<p>Broads Authority Heritage and Design</p>	<p>The site sits immediately to the north of the Crown Point Estate, a Registered Park and Garden and a designated heritage asset, the setting of which would need to be considered in any development. To the immediate west of the site are earthworks which are identified on the Norfolk HER (<a href="#">NHER 52118</a>). These are not designated so should not necessarily be a constraint.</p> <p>Development along this part of Whitlingham Lane is predominantly characterised by detached and semi-detached cottages sitting parallel to the street on relatively substantial plots, with a degree of separation between them. Some of these former estate workers' cottages have been identified as locally identified heritage assets in the emerging Trowse Neighbourhood Plan. I therefore think that it is unlikely that a development of 8 units on this site would be appropriate as it would be contrary to the settlement pattern and established densities in the area and would therefore appear incongruous. This in turn would have a detrimental impact on the RPG and wider landscape area.</p> <p>The existing boatyard also contributes to the character of the area, reflecting the use of the site until recently as boat and water-related. As such, the preferred option would be for the existing buildings (at least the larger one to the west of the site) to be retained and converted and the boatyard character of the site to be retained in any future development.</p>
<p>Trowse with Newton Parish Council</p>	<p>The Council discussed the call for sites proposal at last night's meeting and it was thought that any development of that site should refer to our Neighbourhood Plan policies.</p>

Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>Section 4 of the Trowse with Newton Neighbourhood Plan discusses the housing type need in Trowse and therefore this should be considered when/if plans are submitted for the former boat yard site. This section also includes details on possible design codes for any developments.</p>
Norfolk County Council Heritage	<p>Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching. Rates amber.</p>
Norfolk County Council Education	<p><b>General Comments, on sites of less than 20 proposed dwellings</b></p> <p>The other sites are deemed suitable to support the existing schools the communities serve and will promote and support the sustainability of the schools in close proximity. Consideration of the impact on walking and cycle routes should be achieved in order to support sustainable modes of transport and reduce families using their motor car where possible.</p> <p>Reducing the numbers on this site will not change our original response to the proposed site.</p>
Broads Authority Landscape Architect	<p>I have reviewed this site for potential for 8 dwellings, I have no objection in principle to the site being allocated for housing, in landscape terms this could help address some of the issues associated with the site and the negative impact its frontage has on Whitlingham Lane. Any development would need to protect and enhance the existing PROW to the east of the site, along with any landscape features deemed to be important (a survey would be required to determine this).</p> <p>I'm struggling to see how the site could support 8 dwellings, without using a cul-de-sac layout, which would not be in-keeping with the overall settlement pattern along Whitlingham Lane. If this allocation was to go forward then this needs some thought in order to guide an appropriate scale and form of development. I'm not sure I'm comfortable with 8 without some justification around how the site could accommodate this.</p> <p>Then asked about 4 to 6 dwellings:</p> <p>Thanks for reconsulting on this, as you know my previous concerns were over the density rather than use of the site. I would be much more comfortable with 4-6 dwellings, I would still encourage any site allocation (if it goes that way) to include guidance on the site layout to ensure best use of the area and to create a layout which is both informed by existing street pattern and the wider landscape setting. A further consideration if back to backs are being put forward that the orientation and aspect of any units is developed alongside consideration of appropriate use of boundary treatments – what I essentially mean is that we wouldn't want lots of close boarded fencing to boundaries that can be seen from public locations.</p>

Stakeholder	Comments
Norfolk County Council Highways	<p>No highway objection to the proposed allocation.</p> <p>These comments were made in relation to the proposed allocation for Class E uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The site is remote from local service and transport provision, but there are pedestrian links to such facilities, albeit the site is likely to be highly reliant on the private motor vehicle as a primary mode of transport.</li> <li>b) Having regard to existing use of the site, the proposed re-development of the site is unlikely to give rise to any specific highway safety concerns or have a severe detrimental residual effect on the highway network.</li> <li>c) c) Currently two points of vehicle access to Whitlingham Lane, it is considered that any development should rationalise to one point of access, along with appropriate parking, cycle and electrical vehicle charging, in accordance with current guidance.</li> </ul> <p>Reducing the numbers on this site will not change our original response to the proposed site.</p>
Norfolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority.	<p><b>Any future planning application for residential development of this site likely to be a minor due to its scale and fall outside of the LLFA remit / consultation thresholds.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of the site lies within Flood Zone 1, however a small part of the site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>• No on-site sewers – Off-site: Foul sewers within 500m of the site.</li> <li>• Site lies within Source Protection Zone 2 (SPPZ).</li> <li>• No flood records on-site. Off-site: No flood records within 500m.</li> <li>• On-site: Small area of surface water ponding / pooling within 0.1% AEP event. Off-site: Surface water flow paths and ponding and pooling in 0.1%, 1% and 3.33% AEP events within 500m of the site.</li> <li>• Part of the site lies within Broads Internal Drainage Board.</li> <li>• No onsite watercourses, however ordinary watercourses (some within the IDB area) and EA main river (River Yare) are located within 100m.</li> <li>• <b>LLFA Assessment: No major surface water issues / constraints identified (GREEN RAG)</b></li> </ul> <p>Reducing the numbers on this site will not change our original response to the proposed site.</p>
Anglian Water Services	<p>This site is within the catchment for Whitlingham WRC. There is a growth scheme to increase dry weather flow headroom in AMP8 (2025-30) at Whitlingham identified in our Business Plan – we received final determination of our plan by Ofwat on 19 December 2024 – the date for Anglian Water’s formal response to the determination is 18<sup>th</sup> February 2025.</p>

Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>Factoring in existing commitments within the catchment, there is no available headroom at the WRC until the growth scheme is delivered and we would recommend a pre-occupancy clause is attached to any grant of permission to ensure development is not occupied until this time.</p> <p>The closest sewer is located over 200m away near Yare Cottages. A water main adjoins the southern boundary of the site along Whitlingham Lane.</p> <p>It is noted that Trowse Neighbourhood Plan was recently successful at referendum and therefore may have policy requirements in terms of proposed uses for the site.</p>
Broads Authority Ecologist	<p>The site is directly south of Whitlingham Little Broad a designated local nature reserve, with reedbed Section 41 habitats to the west and mature trees to the east</p> <p>The site is currently a small boat yard but contains trees and shrubs – these should be retained and enhanced.</p> <p>Likely to be water quality impacts and subject to nutrient neutrality.</p>

## 10.4. Site assessment

Please note that the site was assessed in the [original HELAA](#) (September 2023) for Class E uses. This assessment in this HELAA part 2 is for residential development.

Site address: The Old Boatyard, Whitlingham Lane, Trowse	
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.	<b>Suggested through first call for sites. Allocation for change in the Preferred Options. Suggested through December 2024 call for sites for dwellings.</b>
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>	<b>0.49 hectares</b>
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>	<b>Brownfield.</b>
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)	<b>Private</b>
Absolute Constraints Check	
Is the site in a ...	
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>	<b>No (SSSI Impact Zone)</b>
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Flood risk zone 3b</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Scheduled Ancient Monument</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Statutory Allotments</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Locally Designated Green Space</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>At risk from Coastal Erosion</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.</i>	
Development Potential	



(number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space):

Initially 8 dwellings. Then 4-6 dwellings.

Density calculator	16.33 dwellings per hectare	
Suitability Assessment		
Constraint	Score red/amber/green	Comments
Access to site		Currently two points of vehicle access to Whitlingham Lane, it is considered that any development should rationalise to one point of access, along with appropriate parking, cycle and electrical vehicle charging, in accordance with current guidance.
Accessibility to local services and facilities		1km to village shop. 1km to bus stop.
Utilities Capacity		Factoring in existing commitments within the catchment, there is no available headroom at the WRC until the growth scheme is delivered and we would recommend a pre-occupancy clause is attached to any grant of permission to ensure development is not occupied until this time.
Utilities Infrastructure		There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road. There is a utilities cabinet on the road frontage. A water main adjoins the southern boundary of the site along Whitlingham Lane.
Contamination and ground stability		Some industrial history that may need assessing. The agent says: ‘the site was formerly a fuel depot and latterly a commercial boatyard. Mindful of this, and notwithstanding the fact that the majority of the site is 'sealed' with hard surfacing, it is considered likely that some level of remediation work will be required to address historic contamination’.
Flood Risk		Very small part flood zone 2 and 3. Small pocket of surface water on site. Built development should avoid these flood zones.
Coastal Change		
Market Attractiveness		Other than limited services and facilities nearby, has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads
Impact	Score red/amber/green	Comments
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		Not likely the site could support 8 dwellings, without using a cul-de-sac layout, which would not be in-keeping with the overall settlement pattern along Whitlingham Lane. The preferred option would be for
Townscape		

		the existing buildings (at least the larger one to the west of the site) to be retained and converted and the boatyard character of the site to be retained in any future development. Any development would need to protect and enhance the existing PROW to the east of the site, along with any landscape features deemed to be important (a survey would be required to determine this). The site is reasonably well screened from the Broad but the land does slope down towards the Broad so the siting, scale, and design of any new buildings would have to be well considered. In addition a suitable landscaping scheme could help lessen potential impacts.
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		The site is directly south of Whitlingham Little Broad a designated local nature reserve, with reedbed Section 41 habitats to the west and mature trees to the east The site is currently a small boat yard but contains trees and shrubs – these should be retained and enhanced. Local nature reserve next door and on small part of site.
Historic Environment		The site sits immediately to the north of the Crown Point Estate, a Registered Park and Garden and a designated heritage asset, the setting of which would need to be considered in any development. Unlikely that a development of 8 units on this site would be appropriate as it would be contrary to the settlement pattern and established densities in the area and would therefore appear incongruous. This in turn would have a detrimental impact on the RPG and wider landscape area. Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching.
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		No highway objection to the proposed allocation. Having regard to existing use of the site, the proposed re-development of the site is unlikely to give rise to any specific highway safety concerns or have a severe detrimental residual effect on the highway network.
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		
<b>Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)</b>		
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Policy reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Draft policy for continued boatyard use and if	POWHI2: Land at Whitlingham Lane	This is a draft policy in the Preferred Options version of the Local Plan, following a call for sites submission as part of the Issues and Options consultation.

meets tests, potentially Class E.		
<b>Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)</b>		
Is the site being marketed? Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where, by whom, how much for etc.)	No	
When might the site be available for development (tick as appropriate)	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	✓
	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):	<b>Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete, so 8 dwellings per year is presumed.</b>	
Comments	<b>Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete.</b>	
<b>Achievability (including viability)</b>		
Comments	Agent says 'The site is located on the edge of the popular village of Trowse. Recent large-scale residential development in the village has demonstrated a very strong demand for housing in this area. As a location where much of the land lies within the Broads Executive Area, and most of the land is on the ownership of a single estate, opportunities for residential development rarely come forward. This is a site in an excellent location (being on the doorstep of both the city and the Country Park, and within the Broads) and with convenient links to the local school, facilities and employment opportunities'.	
<b>Overcoming Constraints</b>		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce to one point of access</li> <li>• Factoring in existing commitments within the catchment, there is no available headroom at the WRC until the growth scheme is delivered and we would recommend a pre-occupancy clause is attached to any grant of permission to ensure development is not occupied until this time.</li> <li>• There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site with the road.</li> <li>• There is a utilities cabinet on the road frontage.</li> <li>• A water main adjoins the southern boundary of the site along Whitlingham Lane.</li> <li>• Some contaminated land remediation likely.</li> <li>• Very small part flood zone 2 and 3. Small pocket of surface water on site. Built development should avoid these flood zones.</li> </ul>	


	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The preferred option would be for the existing buildings (at least the larger one to the west of the site) to be retained and converted and the boatyard character of the site to be retained in any future development.</li> <li>• Any development would need to protect and enhance the existing PROW to the east of the site, along with any landscape features deemed to be important (a survey would be required to determine this).</li> <li>• Trees and shrubs maintained</li> <li>• Designed to accommodate part of nature reserve on site.</li> <li>• The site is reasonably well screened from the Broad but the land does slope down towards the Broad so the siting, scale, and design of any new buildings would have to be well considered. In addition a suitable landscaping scheme could help lessen potential impacts.</li> <li>• The site sits immediately to the north of the Crown Point Estate, a Registered Park and Garden and a designated heritage asset, the setting of which would need to be considered in any development.</li> <li>• Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching.</li> <li>• GI RAMS – payment likely.</li> <li>• BNG – on site or off-site mitigation.</li> <li>• Nutrient Neutrality.</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 1 year to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	None related to the HELAA as the above could be addressed through the design and implementation of the scheme.
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is suitable for residential development.	

# 11. Land at Half Moon Barn, Upper Street Horning

## 11.1. Map of site

Call for sites - December 2024

Land at Half Moon Barn, Upper Street Horning Norwich



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

## 11.2. Photos of site



Looking north across the site.

See photos for the next site (land to the north of Upper Street) for the context of the site and the access to the site.

## 11.3. Stakeholder comments

Stakeholder	Comments
Broads Authority Development Management Team	<p>This site is on the main road, but that does not make it a sustainable location and, beyond a potential for a reasonable bus service, it meets none of the basic criteria for a sustainable location and would not be supported on this basis.</p> <p>The site is used for arable farming and appears to be Grade 1 on the agricultural land classification so should be protected in its existing use.</p> <p>I was surprised to see that part of the larger site is partly in flood zone 3 which would limit development in that area.</p>
Broads Authority Heritage and Design	<p>The site has no particular heritage constraints although the settlement around Upper Street has quite a distinctive character with a number of historic buildings clustered in this area and this character would need to be respected. This particular site allows glimpsed views across the wider landscape and down to the river Ant and designated heritage assets such as the grade II listed Neave's Mill,</p> <p>I would suggest that any development should be towards the southern end of the site so that it more closely relates to the existing settlement and also thereby reducing any potential impact on the open countryside to the north, which slopes down towards the river Ant. The site could probably accommodate one unit, I am less convinced that two could be successfully accommodated on the site.</p>
Horning Parish Council	<p>The Council noted that there were no credible solutions regarding infrastructure at all in place and that the proposals were the result of a desk-exercise which was entirely untenable. The Council noted that the smaller plot could not be built on as</p>



Stakeholder	Comments
	there are rights of way over the proposed site. The Council also noted that the larger plot could not be built on the basis that there is a SSSI on it. The Council also noted that the issue with the drainage situation at Knackers Wood posed a significant issue. <b>Council agreed to issue the strongest possible objection.</b>
Norfolk County Council Education	The proposal will support the local school with current low numbers. This will provide much needed housing to support the pupil population, but it is not substantial enough to support long term the sustainability of the school. This could dependant on the mix of housing encourages families to select alternative schools in the surrounding villages of Ludham and Salhouse which may require some contribution to home to school transport.
Norfolk County Council Heritage	Based on currently available information would not ask for conditions for archaeological work.
Broads Authority Landscape Architect	I don't have any objection to this in principle, providing that a sensible boundary line can be chosen and the necessary guiding principles around use of boundary treatments and well-placed screening were to be utilised, along with appropriate use of building materials and heights – which should mitigate any issues resulting from any visual change.
Norfolk County Council Highways	Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. There is a lack of footway provision. Adequate visibility from access is likely to be unachievable. New access onto a corridor of movement not supported.
Norfolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located within Flood Zone 1. Flood Zones 2 and 3 lie to the north of the site.</li> <li>• No on-site sewers – Foul sewers run along boundary where the site accesses onto Upper Street.</li> <li>• Not located within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ).</li> <li>• No flood records on-site and no external and internal flood records within 500m.</li> <li>• On-site: None. Off-site Minor surface water flowpaths and small areas of surface water ponding / pooling in 0.1%, 1% and 3.33% AEP events.</li> <li>• Site lies outside of any Broads Internal Drainage Board area (IDB area lies to the north, east south and west).</li> <li>• On-site: None. Off-site: ordinary watercourses (some within IDB area) and drainage ditches located within 100m and EA main river more than 500m away.</li> <li>• <b>LLFA Assessment: No major surface water issues / constraints identified (Green RAG)</b></li> <li>• <b>The LLFA advise that we are aware of flooding issues associated with the village of Horning and the involvement in the area of the Norfolk Strategic Flooding Alliance (NSFA). Ferry Road in Horning (to the west of this site) is also identified on the NSFA Tranche List due to known flooding issues.</b></li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Comments
Anglian Water Services	<p>The sites are within the Horning Knackers Wood WRC catchment that currently does not have dry weather flow headroom to accommodate growth in the catchment – for the reasons set out and according to our Statement of Fact.</p> <p>Whilst there is a growth scheme being delivered for Horning by the end of March 2025, to ensure it is operationally compliant with a revised dry weather flow permit; this is to allow for mass infiltration as a result of the high water table and river overtopping into our network. We would need to undertake a period of monitoring of incoming flows to be certain that the site will operate in accordance with the consented dry weather flow, before a decision could be made on whether additional growth could be accommodated and what quantum of growth would be sustainable over the longer term in combination with other environmental capacity constraints.</p> <p>For the larger site there is a sewer that runs along the southern and western boundaries of the site. There are easements for many of our underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.</p>
Essex and Suffolk Water	<p>Again we do not supply water to customers in this area but we do have assets close by to the proposed areas. We have a pumping station at the River Bure in this location and some strategic mains in the locality. They do not seem to run through or adjacent to the fields proposed and we would always expect developers to contact us for up to date underground services maps, but worth you knowing that there are large pipes in the roadways and fields around this area.</p>
North Norfolk District Council	<p>Unless I am mistaken the two sites are fall into the wider NNDC district boundary but are adjacent to our LPA Area.</p> <p>Horning is considered a constrained small growth Village in our emerging local plan and as such no housing requirements can be attributed to the village. The surrounding area which abuts the site(s) would be considered to fall into the Countryside policy Area where development is restricted in line with policy SS2. Although the site(s) is outside the village and falls under the BA LPA it is expected that the same constraints would apply as it falls into the same catchment. Our inspector advised in his post hearing letter earlier this year that <i>there is no realistic prospect of the local water recycling centre meeting the required environmental standards in the foreseeable future...[examination ref EH006(h)]</i>. This was based on the known position which has not changed and statutory objections . And as such our Plan should be altered so as not to rely on any housing from this location . As the BA are fully aware development in Horning is subject to a joint position statement with NNDC , EA, and BA and an updated Statement of Fact from Anglian Water . Issues to Horning and the surrounding area relate to Water</p>

Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>Recycling Centre permit compliance, increased flows due to groundwater and surface water infiltration and nutrient loading. The Council is working jointly with the Broads Authority, the EA and Anglian Water to resolve this, however it is clear that given the deliverability issues no growth can or should be relied upon in local plans</p> <p>The 2017 joint position statement was updated in 2023 along with a separate updated statement of Fact by Anglian Water. Both can be accessed through our examination library ref EX012 and EX013 as attached for reference</p> <p>Our understanding in relation to Pins is that a new area of “pragmatism “ is being applied in response to the new Housing ministers request for PINS to focus their <i>time on plans that are considered are capable of being found sound.....in the exchange of letters which were made available to LPA during July / August 2024 it states Pragmatism should not be used to address fundamental issues with the soundness of a plan, which would be likely to require pausing or delaying the examination process for more than six months overall”</i> it is considered unlikely that the issuing surrounding the WRC can be resolved in which as short period of time so our advice would not to rely on these sites</p>
Broads Authority Ecologist	<p>From the aerals, the site appears to be in arable use.</p> <p>The site has boundary trees and hedgerows which should be retained and enhanced. These are likely to support protected species, namely bats, birds, and reptiles. Also hedgehog and nesting skylark.</p> <p>Likely localised increase in recreational disturbance to designated sites.</p>

## 11.4. Site assessment

Planning history:

Application number	Description	Decision	Date
BA/2009/0267/CCP	Rural Demonstration Project - A1062 Self-Explaining road	No objections – neighbouring authority consultation.	21/10/2009

Site address: Land at Half Moon Barn, Upper Street Horning		
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.		<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites.</b>
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>		<b>0.215 hectares</b>
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>		<b>Part brownfield and part greenfield.</b>
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)		<b>Private</b>
<b>Absolute Constraints Check</b>		
<b>Is the site in a ...</b>		
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>	<b>No (SSSI Impact Zone)</b>	
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>NbeaFlood risk zone 3b</b>	<b>No - Flood zone 1 according to SFRA</b>	
<b>Scheduled Ancient Monument</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Statutory Allotments</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Locally Designated Green Space</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>At risk from Coastal Erosion</b>	<b>No</b>	
<i>If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.</i>		
<b>Development Potential</b> (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): <b>2 dwellings.</b>		
<b>Density calculator</b>	<b>9.3 dwellings per hectare</b>	
<b>Suitability Assessment</b>		
<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Access to site		Access to site is near a bend in the road. Speed limit is national speed limit applies. Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. Adequate visibility from access is likely to be unachievable. New access onto a corridor of movement not supported.
Accessibility to local services and facilities		Shop – 1.4km, no footways School 1.2km, no footways Bus stop, 150m, no footways
Utilities Capacity		In Horning Knackers Wood Water Recycling Centre catchment – no foul water capacity.

Utilities Infrastructure		Pumping station at the River Bure in this location and some strategic mains in the locality and there are large pipes in the roadways and fields around this area.
Contamination and ground stability		Agent says: 'The ground is stable and there are no known ground contamination issues'.
Flood Risk		In flood zone 1.
Coastal Change		
Market Attractiveness		Other than limited services and facilities nearby, has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		Development should be towards the southern end of the site so that it more closely relates to the existing settlement and also thereby reducing any potential impact on the open countryside to the north, which slopes down towards the river Ant. The site could probably accommodate one unit, I am less convinced that two could be successfully accommodated on the site. Views to the Broads. Guiding principles around use of boundary treatments and well-placed screening were to be utilised, along with appropriate use of building materials and heights should mitigate any issues resulting from any visual change. Part grade 1 agricultural land.
Townscape		
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		The site has boundary trees and hedgerows which should be retained and enhanced. These are likely to support protected species, namely bats, birds, and reptiles. Also hedgehog and nesting skylark.
Historic Environment		The site has no particular heritage constraints although the settlement around Upper Street has quite a distinctive character with a number of historic buildings clustered in this area and this character would need to be respected. This particular site allows glimpsed views across the wider landscape and down to the river Ant and designated heritage assets such as the grade II listed Neave's Mill.
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. There is a lack of footway provision
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		The neighbouring uses are residential and agricultural.

Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)		
Designation	Policy reference	Comments
None		
Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)		
Is the site being marketed? Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where, by whom, how much for etc.)	No	
When might the site be available for development (tick as appropriate)	Immediately	✓
	Within 5 years	✓
	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):		Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete, so 2 dwellings per year is presumed.
Comments	Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete.	
Achievability (including viability)		
Comments	Agent says 'The site is located in a popular area close to Horning where there is demand for new housing. Development of the site is considered achievable due to the absence of abnormal constraints and presence of an existing access from Upper Street'.	
Overcoming Constraints		
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to site is near a bend in the road. Speed limit is national speed limit applies. Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. Adequate visibility from access is likely to be unachievable. New access onto a corridor of movement not supported.</li> <li>Pumping station at the River Bure in this location and some strategic mains in the locality and there are large pipes in the roadways and fields around this area.</li> <li>Upper Street has quite a distinctive character with a number of historic buildings clustered in this area and this character would need to be respected.</li> <li>Views to the Broads.</li> <li>Development not able to overcome access to services and facilities.</li> <li>Scheme would need to consider the woodland and mature trees on the boundary with the road.</li> <li>GI RAMS – payment likely.</li> <li>BNG – on site or off site mitigation.</li> <li>Part on grade 1 agricultural land.</li> </ul>	




	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guiding principles around use of boundary treatments and well-placed screening were to be utilised, along with appropriate use of building materials and heights should mitigate any issues resulting from any visual change.</li> <li>• Two dwellings unlikely to be supported.</li> <li>• Horning Knacker's Wood Water Recycling Centre issues.</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 1 year to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	<p>Access to services.</p> <p>Grade 1 agricultural land.</p> <p>Horning Knackers Wood Water Recycling Centre capacity issues.</p> <p>Highways objection.</p> <p>Adequate visibility from access is likely to be unachievable.</p> <p>New access onto a corridor of movement not supported.</p>
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for residential development.	

## 12. Land to the north of Upper Street Horning

### 12.1. Map of site

Call for sites - December 2024

Land to the north of Upper Street Horning Norwich



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.



## 12.2. Photos of site



Looking to the east.



Looking to the north.



Taken from the road, looking north



Showing the southern boundary of the site.

### **Photos showing the access to this site and the other site in Upper Street (Half Moon Barn)**



Upper Street heading west.



Upper Street heading south





Looking south, taken from the junction



Showing the access

### 12.3. Stakeholder comments

Stakeholder	Comments
Broads Authority Development Management Team	<p>This site is on the main road, but that does not make it a sustainable location and, beyond a potential for a reasonable bus service, it meets none of the basic criteria for a sustainable location and would not be supported on this basis.</p> <p>The site is used for arable farming and appears to be Grade 1 on the agricultural land classification so should be protected in its existing use.</p> <p>I was surprised to see that part of the larger site is partly in flood zone 3 which would limit development in that area.</p>
Broads Authority Heritage and Design	<p>The site contains earthworks of undated ditches and pits which are recorded on the Norfolk HER (NHER: 49282), which may be an archaeological constraint. The site is also in relatively close proximity to Grange Farm to the west, which is a grade II listed building although any impact on the immediate setting of the listed building is likely to be limited, due to the bend in the road and the wooded belt between the two sites. However, the listed farm and its curtilage listed structures and the historic buildings clustered to the south-east of the site do give a distinct character to the wider area within which the site is located.</p> <p>It is considered that part of this character is the gaps in the development along Upper Street, which emphasise the rural setting of the existing development. This particular site therefore contributes to the character of the area in its existing state and also allows glimpsed views across the wider landscape and down to the river</p>

Stakeholder	Comments
	Ant and designated heritage assets such as the grade II listed Neave's Mill, due to its raised position above the marshes located to the south. This gap site therefore enables a visual relationship between this area and the wider Broads' landscape beyond and I would therefore be reluctant to see any development onto this site.
Horning Parish Council	The Council noted that there were no credible solutions regarding infrastructure at all in place and that the proposals were the result of a desk-exercise which was entirely untenable. The Council noted that the smaller plot could not be built on as there are rights of way over the proposed site. The Council also noted that the larger plot could not be built on the basis that there is a SSSI on it. The Council also noted that the issue with the drainage situation at Knackers Wood posed a significant issue. <b>Council agreed to issue the strongest possible objection.</b>
Norfolk County Council Education	The proposal will support the local school with current low numbers. This will provide much needed housing to support the pupil population, but it is not substantial enough to support long term the sustainability of the school. This could dependant on the mix of housing encourages families to select alternative schools in the surrounding villages of Ludham and Salhouse which may require some contribution to home to school transport.
Norfolk County Council Heritage	Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching.
Broads Authority Landscape Architect	I couldn't support this. It looks to be a very sensitive site, with strong intervisibility with the wider landscape to the north in particular. PROW at Horning FP13 and Ludham FP11 present a sensitivity in terms of visual receptors. The slightly rolling topography of the field is unusual and special within the area, marking a transition to the uplands, not to mention very beautiful, there are also some potentially valuable landscape features such as the groups of trees scrub and hedgerow which would no doubt be under pressure from any development if the site were allocated. If this site were to be allocated and developed it would result in the loss of visual openness, destruction of the field pattern and a loss or erosion of the ability to visually understand the transition between landscape types (low lying marshland to upland) in the area. All of this would be a great shame and could not be justified in terms of landscape considerations.
Norfolk County Council Highways	Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. There is a lack of footway provision. Adequate visibility from access is likely to be unachievable. New access onto a corridor of movement not supported.
Norfolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located mainly within Flood Zone 1 but Flood Zones 2 and 3 encroach into a small area to the north of the site.</li> <li>• On-site sewers – Yes - Foul sewers run along the south and west site boundaries.</li> <li>• Not located within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ).</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No flood records on-site and no external and internal flood records within 500m.</li> <li>• On-site: Yes – Small area of surface water ponding / pooling in 0.1% AEP event. Off-site: Minor surface water flowpaths and small areas of surface water ponding / pooling within 0.1%, 1% and 3.33% AEP events.</li> <li>• Site lies outside of any Broads Internal Drainage Board area (IDB area lies to the north, east south and west).</li> <li>• On-site: None. Off-site: ordinary watercourses (some within IDB area) and drainage ditches located within 100m and EA main river more than 500m away.</li> <li>• <b>LLFA Assessment: No major surface water issues / constraints identified (Green RAG)</b></li> <li>• <b>The LLFA advise that we are aware of flooding issues associated with the village of Horning and the involvement of the Norfolk Strategic Flooding Alliance (NSFA) in the area. Ferry Road in Horning (to the west of this site) is also identified on the NSFA Tranche List due to known flooding issues.</b></li> </ul>
Anglian Water Services	<p>The sites are within the Horning Knackers Wood WRC catchment that currently does not have dry weather flow headroom to accommodate growth in the catchment – for the reasons set out and according to our Statement of Fact.</p> <p>Whilst there is a growth scheme being delivered for Horning by the end of March 2025, to ensure it is operationally compliant with a revised dry weather flow permit; this is to allow for mass infiltration as a result of the high water table and river overtopping into our network. We would need to undertake a period of monitoring of incoming flows to be certain that the site will operate in accordance with the consented dry weather flow, before a decision could be made on whether additional growth could be accommodated and what quantum of growth would be sustainable over the longer term in combination with other environmental capacity constraints.</p> <p>For the larger site there is a sewer that runs along the southern and western boundaries of the site. There are easements for many of our underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.</p>
North Norfolk District Council	<p>Unless I am mistaken the two sites are fall into the wider NNDC district boundary but are adjacent to our LPA Area.</p> <p>Horning is considered a constrained small growth Village in our emerging local plan and as such no housing requirements can be attributed to the village. The surrounding area which abuts the site(s) would be considered to fall into the Countryside policy Area where development is restricted in line with policy SS2. Although the site(s) is outside the village and falls under the BA LPA it is</p>



Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>expected that the same constraints would apply as it falls into the same catchment. Our inspector advised in his post hearing letter earlier this year that there <i>is no realistic prospect of the local water recycling centre meeting the required environmental standards in the foreseeable future...[examination ref EH006(h)]</i>. This was based on the known position which has not changed and statutory objections . And as such our Plan should be altered so as not to rely on any housing from this location . As the BA are fully aware development in Horning is subject to a joint position statement with NNDC , EA, and BA and an updated Statement of Fact from Anglian Water . Issues to Horning and the surrounding area relate to Water Recycling Centre permit compliance, increased flows due to groundwater and surface water infiltration and nutrient loading. The Council is working jointly with the Broads Authority, the EA and Anglian Water to resolve this, however it is clear that given the deliverability issues no growth can or should be relied upon in local plans</p> <p>The 2017 joint position statement was updated in 2023 along with a separate updated statement of Fact by Anglian Water . Both can be accessed through our examination library ref EX012 and EX013 as attached for reference</p> <p>Our understanding in relation to Pins is that a new area of “pragmatism “ is being applied in response to the new Housing ministers request for PINS to focus their <i>time on plans that are considered are capable of being found sound.....in the exchange of letters which were made available to LPA during July / August 2024</i> it states <i>Pragmatism should not be used to address fundamental issues with the soundness of a plan, which would be likely to require pausing or delaying the examination process for more than six months overall”</i> it is considered unlikely that the issuing surrounding the WRC can be resolved in which as short period of time so our advice would not to rely on these sites</p>
Essex and Suffolk Water	<p>Again we do not supply water to customers in this area but we do have assets close by to the proposed areas. We have a pumping station at the River Bure in this location and some strategic mains in the locality. They do not seem to run through or adjacent to the fields proposed and we would always expect developers to contact us for up to date underground services maps, but worth you knowing that there are large pipes in the roadways and fields around this area.</p>
Broads Authority Ecologist	<p>From the aerials, the site appears to be in arable use.</p> <p>The site has boundary trees and hedgerows which should be retained and enhanced. These are likely to support protected species, namely bats, birds, and reptiles. Also hedgehog and nesting skylark.</p> <p>Likely localised increase in recreational disturbance to designated sites.</p>

## 12.4. Site assessment

<b>Site address: Land to the north of Upper Street Horning</b>		
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.	<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites. No planning application history for this specific site.</b>	
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>	<b>1.54 hectares</b>	
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>	<b>Part brownfield and part greenfield.</b>	
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)	<b>Private</b>	
<b>Absolute Constraints Check</b>		
<b>Is the site in a ...</b>		
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>	<b>No (SSSI Impact Zone)</b>	
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Flood risk zone 3b</b>	<b>No – mostly flood zone 1, some 2 and 3 according to SFRA – but allocation could reflect the flood risk.</b>	
<b>Scheduled Ancient Monument</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Statutory Allotments</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Locally Designated Green Space</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>At risk from Coastal Erosion</b>	<b>No</b>	
<i>If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.</i>		
<b>Development Potential</b> (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): <b>45 dwellings.</b>		
<b>Density calculator</b>	<b>29.22 dwellings per hectare</b>	
<b>Suitability Assessment</b>		
<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Access to site		Access to site is near a bend in the road. Speed limit is national speed limit applies. Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. Adequate visibility from access is likely to be unachievable. New access onto a corridor of movement not supported.
Accessibility to local services and facilities		Shop – 1.4km, no footways School 1.2km, no footways Bus stop, 150m, no footways
Utilities Capacity		In Horning Knackers Wood Water Recycling Centre catchment – no foul water capacity.
Utilities Infrastructure		Essex and Suffolk Water have a pumping station at the River Bure in this location and some strategic mains in the locality. They do not seem to run through or adjacent to the fields proposed and we would always expect developers to contact us for up to date

		underground services maps, but there are large pipes in the roadways and fields around this area.
Contamination and ground stability		Agent says: 'The ground is stable and there are no known ground contamination issues'.
Flood Risk		In flood zone 1. Mostly flood zone 1, some 2 and 3 according to SFRA – but allocation could reflect the flood risk.
Coastal Change		
Market Attractiveness		Other than limited services and facilities nearby, has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		It is considered that part of this character is the gaps in the development along Upper Street, which emphasise the rural setting of the existing development. This particular site therefore contributes to the character of the area in its existing state and also allows glimpsed views across the wider landscape and down to the river Ant and designated heritage assets such as the grade II listed Neave's Mill, due to its raised position above the marshes located to the south. This gap site therefore enables a visual relationship between this area and the wider Broads' landscape beyond.
Townscape		<p>It looks to be a very sensitive site, with strong intervisibility with the wider landscape to the north in particular. The slightly rolling topography of the field is unusual and special within the area, marking a transition to the uplands, not to mention very beautiful, there are also some potentially valuable landscape features such as the groups of trees scrub and hedgerow which would no doubt be under pressure from any development if the site were allocated. If this site were to be allocated and developed it would result in the loss of visual openness, destruction of the field pattern and a loss or erosion of the ability to visually understand the transition between landscape types (low lying marshland to upland) in the area.</p> <p>Views to the Broads.</p> <p>Part grade 1 agricultural land.</p>
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		The site has boundary trees and hedgerows which should be retained and enhanced. These are likely to support protected species, namely bats, birds, and reptiles. Also hedgehog and nesting skylark.

		Deciduous woodland/hedges borders site. Mature trees.
Historic Environment		The site contains earthworks of undated ditches and pits which are recorded on the Norfolk HER (NHER: 49282), which may be an archaeological constraint. The site is also in relatively close proximity to Grange Fram to the west, which is a grade II listed building although any impact on the immediate setting of the listed building is likely to be limited, due to the bend in the road and the wooded belt between the two sites. However, the listed farm and its curtilage listed structures and the historic buildings clustered to the south-east of the site do give a distinct character to the wider area within which the site is located. Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. New access onto a corridor of movement not supported.
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		The neighbouring uses are residential and agricultural.
<b>Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)</b>		
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Policy reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
None		
<b>Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)</b>		
Is the site being marketed? Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where, by whom, how much for etc.)	No	
When might the site be available for development (tick as appropriate)	Immediately	✓
	Within 5 years	✓
	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):		<b>Agent says will take up to 2 years to complete, so 25 dwellings per year is presumed.</b>
Comments	<b>Agent says will take up to 2 years to complete.</b>	
<b>Achievability (including viability)</b>		

Comments	Agent says 'The site is located in a popular area close to Horning where there is demand for new housing. Development of the site is considered achievable due to the absence of abnormal constraints and presence of an existing access from Upper Street'.
<b>Overcoming Constraints</b>	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to site is near a bend in the road. Speed limit is national speed limit applies. Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. Adequate visibility from access is likely to be unachievable. New access onto a corridor of movement not supported.</li> <li>• Views to the Broads.</li> <li>• Conditions for a programme of archaeological work starting with trial trenching</li> <li>• Development not able to overcome access to services and facilities.</li> <li>• Scheme would need to consider the woodland and mature trees on the boundary with the road.</li> <li>• GI RAMS – payment likely.</li> <li>• BNG – on site or off site mitigation.</li> <li>• Part on grade 1 agricultural land.</li> <li>• Horning Knacker's Wood Water Recycling Centre issues.</li> <li>• Essex and Suffolk Water have a pumping station at the River Bure in this location and some strategic mains in the locality.</li> <li>• There are large pipes in the roadways and fields around this area.</li> <li>• In flood zone 1. Mostly flood zone 1, some 2 and 3 according to SFRA – but allocation could reflect the flood risk.</li> <li>• This gap site enables a visual relationship between this area and the wider Broads' landscape beyond</li> <li>• A very sensitive site, with strong intervisibility with the wider landscape to the north in particular</li> <li>• The site has boundary trees and hedgerows which should be retained and enhanced. These are likely to support protected species, namely bats, birds, and reptiles.</li> <li>• Heritage assets in area.</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 2 years to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	<p>Access to services.</p> <p>Grade 1 agricultural land.</p> <p>Horning Knackers Wood Water Recycling Centre capacity issues</p> <p>Landscape impact.</p> <p>Highway Objection to the proposed allocation.</p> <p>Adequate visibility from access is likely to be unachievable.</p> <p>New access onto a corridor of movement not supported.</p>
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	

According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for residential development.




# 13. Car Park at former Windboats site, Grange Walk, Norwich Road, Wroxham

## 13.1. Map of site

Call for sites - December 2024

Car Park at former Windboats site, Grange Walk,



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.



## 13.2. Photos of site



Showing the car park site



Looking north to the river and boatyards



Showing the southern boundary



Showing the western boundary

See photos for the next site (Former Windboats site) regarding the access to the sites.

## 13.3. Stakeholder comments

Stakeholder	Comments
Broads Authority Development Management Team	There is recent history at this site, issues raised regarding the need to market the site in accordance with local plan policy for employment sites, and the restrictive nature of the access which Highways have cited previously. It may be that the 2-dwelling proposal would be acceptable in highway terms as it is a low-level provision, but I would anticipate an objection to 15 dwellings. The marketing side would need to be satisfied.
Broads Authority Heritage and Design	The site sits just outside the Wroxham Conservation Area and immediately to the east / south-east of the Grade II listed The Grange, and as such, the setting of the listed building will need to be considered in any proposal. However, the primary elevation of The Grange addresses Norwich Road and as such the principle of appropriately designed and scaled development here may be acceptable. In terms

Stakeholder	Comments
	of the character of the area, the site is somewhat transitional in that it sits between boatyards to the north and residential to the west and south and so the design of any proposals here would need to reflect that transitional character.
Wroxham Parish Council	Wroxham Parish Council support these sites for residential development. They are in a prominent location in the village, perfect for residential dwellings with pedestrian access to shops and services. The sites complement the Wroxham Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) policy HBE1. The Parish Council would very much like the site to be developed with housing for older people in mind, as per policy HBE2 of the WNP.
Norfolk County Council Education	<p><b>General Comments, on sites of less than 20 proposed dwellings</b></p> <p>The other sites are deemed suitable to support the existing schools the communities serve and will promote and support the sustainability of the schools in close proximity. Consideration of the impact on walking and cycle routes should be achieved in order to support sustainable modes of transport and reduce families using their motor car where possible.</p>
Broads Authority Landscape Architect	No objection to an allocation for this in principle, providing that building heights would be informed by consideration of potential visibility from within the immediate area. If allocated some guidance or restrictions should be placed upon the use of boundary treatments to ensure they include soft treatments and avoid close boarded fencing in the more visible areas.
Norfolk County Council Highways	Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. Adequate visibility from existing access to the south on A1151 Norwich Road is likely to be unachievable.
Norfolk County Council Heritage	Based on currently available information would not ask for conditions for archaeological work.
Norfolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located within Flood Zone 1. Flood Zones 2 and 3 lie to the north and east of the site.</li> <li>• On-site sewers – Foul sewers run across the site and along part of the boundary.</li> <li>• Located within Source Protection Zone 2 (SPZ).</li> <li>• No flood records on-site. External and internal flood records within 500m.</li> <li>• On-site: Surface water flowpath in all three AEP events encroaches the site and passes across the site access (Grange Walk). Off-site Significant surface water flow paths and areas of surface water ponding / pooling in 0.1%, 1% and 3.33% AEP events.</li> <li>• Small part of site to north and access road falls within Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board area.</li> <li>• On-site: None. Off-site: ordinary watercourses (some within IDB area) and drainage ditches located within 100m and EA main river more than 500m away.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>LLFA Assessment: Moderate surface water / flooding constraints identified (which will require further assessment by the Local Planning Authority (AMBER RAG))</b></li> </ul>
Anglian Water Services	<p>The sites are within the Belaugh WRC catchment and there is dry weather flow headroom available to accommodate the growth arising from these proposed sites.</p> <p>There are AW assets within the proposed sites – comprising foul sewers. There are easements for many of our underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.</p>
Broads Authority Ecologist	<p>From the aerals the site has boundary trees and hedges, these should be retained and enhanced. The site could support protected species, namely bats and birds, possibly reptiles and hedgehog.</p> <p>The site is within the SSSI impact zone.</p> <p>Possible water quality issues due to the close location to a River Bure boat yard.</p>

### 13.4. Site assessment

BA/2019/0214/FUL | Erection of two dwellings | Redundant Car Park Serving Former Windboats Marine Site Grange Walk Wroxham Norfolk. Refused. 21 Aug 2019. Main reason: not marketed.

Appeal Ref: APP/E9505/W/19/3237552 13 January 2020. The development proposed is the redevelopment of a redundant car park site to provide two new dwellings. The appeal is dismissed: ‘the proposed development would lead to the unacceptable loss of the commercial use of the site contrary to Policies SP11, DM26 and DM28 of the Local Plan’.

Site address: Car Park at former Windboats site, Grange Walk, Norwich Road, Wroxham	
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.	<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites.</b> <b>See above for planning history.</b>
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>	<b>0.0957 hectares</b>
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>	<b>Brownfield – car park.</b>
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)	<b>Private</b>
Absolute Constraints Check	
Is the site in a ...	
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>	<b>No (SSSI Impact Zone)</b>
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	<b>No</b>

Flood risk zone 3b		No - Flood zone 1 according to SFRA
Scheduled Ancient Monument		No
Statutory Allotments		No
Locally Designated Green Space		No
At risk from Coastal Erosion		No
If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.		
Development Potential (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): 2 dwellings.		
Density calculator		20.83 dwellings per hectare
Suitability Assessment		
Constraint	Score red/amber/green	Comments
Access to site		Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. Adequate visibility from existing access to the south on A1151 Norwich Road is likely to be unachievable.
Accessibility to local services and facilities		Site is within the development boundary. Bus stop: 200m Train station: 904m Roys: 525m Primary school: 1km GP: 1.6Km Secondary school: 1.2km
Utilities Capacity		
Utilities Infrastructure		There are cables overhead. There are AW assets within the proposed sites – comprising foul sewers. There are easements for many of our underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.
Contamination and ground stability		Use as car park likely means limited potential for contamination.
Flood Risk		In flood zone 1. Some surface water flooding on boundary.
Coastal Change		
Market Attractiveness		Has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads. Potential concern regarding bringing residential
Impact	Score red/amber/green	Comments
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		The building heights would need to be informed by consideration of potential visibility from within the immediate area. If allocated some guidance or



Townscape		restrictions should be placed upon the use of boundary treatments to ensure they include soft treatments and avoid close boarded fencing in the more visible areas. In terms of the character of the area, the site is somewhat transitional in that it sits between boatyards to the north and residential to the west and south and so the design of any proposals here would need to reflect that transitional character.
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		The site has boundary trees and hedges, these should be retained and enhanced. The site could support protected species, namely bats and birds, possibly reptiles and hedgehog.
Historic Environment		Listed building around close to the site. Near to a conservation area.
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		<p>Agent says: 'As a commercial site both of these accesses would have dealt with reasonably high levels of traffic and the vehicle movements associated with the proposed residential redevelopment of the site must be considered in the context of this recent historical use. Pre-application discussions with NCC have been carried out (see submitted pre-a for details) and, based on the outcome of these discussions, it is not considered that highways represents a significant constraint in the development of this site'.</p> <p>Will closing two car parks result in illegal or inconsiderate parking by those visiting the site?</p>
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		<p>Whilst holiday homes exist a similar distance to the boatyards in the area, this would be bringing permanent residential nearer to a working boatyard.</p> <p>Asked Agent regarding loss of car park spaces and potential for illegal/inconsiderate parking in the area as a result. Agent says 'There are no staff as the car park served the former Windboats sheds - these have been demolished. The car park is occasionally used as overflow by Norfolk Broad Direct, however that is an ad hoc and occasional use and represents a very low value use of a well-located site'.</p>
<b>Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)</b>		
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Policy reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
None		



Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)		
<p>Is the site being marketed?</p> <p>Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where, by whom, how much for etc.)</p>	<p>No. Agent says: 'The site was marketed in 2018 for a period of circa 6 months, being made available as general employment land. After a marketing campaign lasting 6 months (comprising 2 months of targeted approaches to prospective purchases by the applicants, and 4 months of wider marketing through Arnolds, the agent) there were no viable enquiries made in respect of the site. The site has subsequently lain empty and largely unused, and the landowner has received no enquiries over this further period'.</p>	
<p>When might the site be available for development (tick as appropriate)</p>	Immediately	When might the site be available for development (tick as appropriate)
	Within 5 years	✓
	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
<p>Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):</p>	<p><b>Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete, so 15 dwellings per year is presumed.</b></p>	
<p>Comments</p>	<p><b>Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete.</b></p>	
Achievability (including viability)		
<p>Comments</p>	<p>Agent says 'The demand for smaller, high quality housing to address the desire for residents in the village to 'downsize' to is well established (see, for example, the supporting text to the Wroxham Neighbourhood Plan policy HBE2). Given the recent issues with nutrient neutrality, there has been a dearth of viable, sustainably located smaller sites for SME developers to bring forward. This site could help to address this demand'.</p>	
Overcoming Constraints		
<p>Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. Adequate visibility from existing access to the south on A1151 Norwich Road is likely to be unachievable.</li> <li>• Will closing two car parks result in illegal or inconsiderate parking by those visiting the site?</li> <li>• Amenity concerns by bringing residential dwellings near to a boatyard.</li> <li>• Concern re impact of closing both car parks.</li> <li>• Scheme would need to address overhead lines.</li> <li>• Scheme would need to consider the surface water issues.</li> <li>• There are AW assets within the proposed sites – comprising foul sewers. There are easements for many of our underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.</li> </ul>	


	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The building heights would need to be informed by consideration of potential visibility from within the immediate area.</li> <li>• If allocated some guidance or restrictions should be placed upon the use of boundary treatments to ensure they include soft treatments and avoid close boarded fencing in the more visible areas. In terms of the character of the area, the site is somewhat transitional in that it sits between boatyards to the north and residential to the west and south and so the design of any proposals here would need to reflect that transitional character.</li> <li>• The site has boundary trees and hedges, these should be retained and enhanced.</li> <li>• The site could support protected species, namely bats and birds, possibly reptiles and hedgehog.</li> <li>• Listed building around close to the site. Near to a conservation area.</li> <li>• GI RAMS – payment likely.</li> <li>• BNG – on site or off-site mitigation.</li> <li>• Nutrient enrichment mitigation.</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 1 year to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. Adequate visibility from existing access to the south on A1151 Norwich Road is likely to be unachievable.</li> <li>• Will closing two car parks result in illegal or inconsiderate parking by those visiting the site?</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for residential development.	

## 14. Former Windboats Site, Grange Walk, Norwich Road, Wroxham

### 14.1. Map of site

Call for sites - December 2024

Former Windboats Site, Grange Walk, Norwich Road,



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.



## 14.2. Photos of site



Looking across the site from the north east corner.



Looking at the site from the car park site.



Showing the white building on site.



Near the easter corner of the site.



Showing the mobile building to the east of the site.



Showing the car park to the east of the site.





Utilities infrastructure on the right



Looking north at the buildings on the site



Showing the footpath to the south of the site.

### Showing the access to this site and the Car Park Site:



Grange Walk



Staithe Way Road



Grange Walk to Norwich Road

### 14.3. Stakeholder comments

Stakeholder	Comments
Broads Authority Development Management Team	There is recent history at this site, issues raised regarding the need to market the site in accordance with local plan policy for employment sites, and the restrictive nature of the access which Highways have cited previously. It may be that the 2 dwelling proposal would be acceptable in highway terms as it is a low level



Stakeholder	Comments
	provision, but I would anticipate an objection to 15 dwellings. The marketing side would need to be satisfied.
Broads Authority Heritage and Design	<p>The eastern end of the site is immediately adjacent to the Wroxham Conservation Area, whilst The Grange which is grade II listed sits at the western end of the site. Any development would have the potential to affect the setting of these two designated heritage assets as well as that of the locally identified heritage assets at 35-37 Staitheway Road. The setting of these heritage assets will therefore need to be considered.</p> <p>The principle of development on the site is likely to be acceptable but the scale and design will need to be appropriate to the transitional character of the area (sitting between the boatyards and residential area) and the predominant scale of development at the northern end of Staitheway Road, within the conservation area.</p> <p>A previous pre-app (BA/2021/0321/PREAPP) provides more detailed comments on the application submitted at that time. It is noted that we raised concerns regarding the 9 flats for older people which were to be accommodated in a four-storey block, the scale of which was considered to be excessive and incongruous in this location. It is noted that 15 units are now proposed and if a similar form of development is still proposed I would therefore suggest that this is potentially too many.</p>
Wroxham Parish Council	Wroxham Parish Council support these sites for residential development. They are in a prominent location in the village, perfect for residential dwellings with pedestrian access to shops and services. The sites complement the Wroxham Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) policy HBE1. The Parish Council would very much like the site to be developed with housing for older people in mind, as per policy HBE2 of the WNP.
Norfolk County Council Education	<p><b>General Comments, on sites of less than 20 proposed dwellings</b></p> <p>The other sites are deemed suitable to support the existing schools the communities serve and will promote and support the sustainability of the schools in close proximity. Consideration of the impact on walking and cycle routes should be achieved in order to support sustainable modes of transport and reduce families using their motor car where possible.</p>
Broads Authority Landscape Architect	Somewhat it depends upon the type of development, which we have no details of. Officers assume it couldn't be 15 larger detached dwellings for example simply due to space. Hopefully design/heritage have provided some guidance on what might be appropriate if anything, in particular given the proximity to the row of historic cottages on Staitheway Rd. Landscape thoughts are that development of this larger area would need to be led by consideration of the immediately adjacent characters which are quite varied, for example the resi areas to the south east are quite green,

Stakeholder	Comments
	cohesive and positive. The transition between resi and the commercial boating area would need some careful thought, so again boundary treatments and frontages would need consideration and probably some guiding principles written in. In terms of visibility, this is already a very active and visually 'busy' area, some consideration would be needed in terms of visibility from the water itself, along with the wider surroundings to guide building heights. Though generally speaking some resi development on this site could address the unsightly nature of the land and create a better transition between land uses than there is currently – providing that materials, building heights and overall massing is correctly guided.
Norfolk County Council Highways	Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. Adequate visibility from existing access to the south on A1151 Norwich Road is likely to be unachievable.
Norfolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located within Flood Zone 1. Flood Zones 2 and 3 lie directly to the north and east of the site.</li> <li>• On-site sewers – Foul sewers run along part of the boundaries.</li> <li>• Located within Source Protection Zone 2 (SPZ).</li> <li>• No flood records on-site. External and internal flood records within 500m.</li> <li>• On-site: Surface water flowpath in 0.1% and 1% AEP events crosses the site and part of the site access (Grange Walk). Off-site Significant surface water flow paths and areas of surface water ponding / pooling in 0.1%, 1% and 3.33% AEP events.</li> <li>• Site lies within Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board area.</li> <li>• On-site: None. Off-site: ordinary watercourses (some within IDB area) and drainage ditches located within 100m and EA main river more than 500m away.</li> <li>• <b>LLFA Assessment: Major surface water issues / constraints identified which will require further assessment by LPA (Red RAG)</b></li> </ul>
Norfolk County Council Heritage	Based on currently available information would not ask for conditions for archaeological work.
Anglian Water Services	<p>The sites are within the Belaugh WRC catchment and there is dry weather flow headroom available to accommodate the growth arising from these proposed sites.</p> <p>There are AW assets within the proposed sites – comprising foul sewers. There are easements for many of our underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.</p>
Broads Authority Ecologist	From the aerials the site appears to be mainly hard standing to the west with a brown field site to the east.

Stakeholder	Comments
	<p>The site could support protected species namely bats and birds, possibly reptiles and hedgehog.</p> <p>The site is within the SSSI impact zone.</p> <p>Possible water quality issues due to the close location to a River Bure boat yard.</p>

#### 14.4. Site assessment

Planning history:

Application number	Description	Decision	Date
BA/2018/0477/PN	Notification for Prior Approval for a proposed change of use of a building from Office Use (Class B1(a)) to a to single dwellinghouse (Class C3)	Prior Approval Granted	22 Jan 2019
BA/2018/0397/DEM	Demolition of former Windboats office building, factory and workshops	Prior Approval not Required	05 Nov 2018
BA/2008/0364/FUL	Alteration and extension to existing building including partial demolition of existing	Approve Subject to Conditions	25 Feb 2009
BA/2008/0278/FUL	Demolition of existing buildings. Erection of extension and alterations to remaining buildings	Approve Subject to Conditions	10 Oct 2008
BA/2007/0123/ADV	Proposed erection of company name sign to front elevation of building	Approve Subject to Conditions	03 Sep 2007
BA/2000/4144/HISTAP	Non-illuminated fascia sign	Approve Subject to Conditions	01 Jun 2000

Former Windboats Site, Grange Walk, Norwich Road, Wroxham	
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.	<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites.</b> <b>See above.</b>
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>	<b>0.50 hectares</b>
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>	<b>Brownfield (buildings have been demolished) and car park. Some buildings: office, mobile building and house. Office has prior approval for residential.</b>
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)	<b>Private</b>
Absolute Constraints Check	
<b>Is the site in a ...</b>	
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>	<b>No (SSSI Impact Zone)</b>
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>	<b>No</b>

Ancient Woodland		No
Flood risk zone 3b		No – Mostly flood zone 1 according to SFRA, with the area around the office building flood zone 2.
Scheduled Ancient Monument		No
Statutory Allotments		No
Locally Designated Green Space		No
At risk from Coastal Erosion		No
If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.		
Development Potential (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): 15 dwellings.		
Density calculator		30 dwellings per hectare – apartments.
Suitability Assessment		
Constraint	Score red/amber/green	Comments
Access to site		Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. Adequate visibility from existing access to the south on A1151 Norwich Road is likely to be unachievable.  Footpath runs along the southern boundary of the site.
Accessibility to local services and facilities		Site is within the development boundary. Bus stop: 200m Train station: 904m Roys: 525m Primary school: 1km GP: 1.6Km Secondary school: 1.2km
Utilities Capacity		
Utilities Infrastructure		There are cables overhead along the boundary of the site. Substation on site. There are AW assets within the proposed sites – comprising foul sewers. There are easements for many of our underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.
Contamination and ground stability		Agent says: ‘As a former commercial/industrial site it is likely that a degree of ground remediation would be required prior to residential redevelopment’.
Flood Risk		In flood zone 1 mainly. Area around office is flood zone 2. Major surface water issues / constraints identified which will require further assessment.
Coastal Change		

Market Attractiveness		Has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads. Potential concern regarding bringing residential
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Score red/amber/green</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		Development would need to be led by consideration of the immediately adjacent characters which are quite varied, for example the resi areas to the southeast are quite green, cohesive and positive. The principle of development on the site is likely to be acceptable but the scale and design will need to be appropriate to the transitional character of the area (sitting between the boatyards and residential area) and the predominant scale of development at the northern end of Staithe Way Road, within the conservation area. The transition between resi and the commercial boating area would need some careful thought, so again boundary treatments and frontages would need consideration and probably some guiding principles written in. Some consideration would be needed in terms of visibility from the water itself, along with the wider surroundings to guide building heights. Materials, building heights and overall massing will need to be correctly guided. 15 apartments could be of a scale and massing that is excessive and incongruous in this location. 15 units could be too many.
Townscape		
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		The site could support protected species namely bats and birds, possibly reptiles and hedgehog.
Historic Environment		Any development would have the potential to affect the setting of two designated heritage assets as well as that of the locally identified heritage assets at 35-37 Staithe Way Road. The setting of these heritage assets will therefore need to be considered. Borders a conservation area.
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		Agent says: 'As a commercial site both of these accesses would have dealt with reasonably high levels of traffic and the vehicle movements associated with the proposed residential redevelopment of the site must be considered in the context of this recent historical use. Pre-application discussions with NCC have been carried out (see submitted pre-a for details) and, based on the outcome of these discussions, it is not considered that



		<p>highways represents a significant constraint in the development of this site'.</p> <p>Will closing two car parks result in illegal or inconsiderate parking by those visiting the site?</p>
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		<p>Whilst holiday homes exist a similar distance to the boatyards in the area, this would be bringing permanent residential nearer to a working boatyard.</p> <p>Asked Agent regarding loss of car park spaces and potential for illegal/inconsiderate parking in the area as a result. Agent says 'There are no staff as the car park served the former Windboats sheds - these have been demolished. The car park is occasionally used as overflow by Norfolk Broad Direct, however that is an ad hoc and occasional use and represents a very low value use of a well-located site'.</p>
<b>Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)</b>		
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Policy reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
None		
<b>Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)</b>		
<p>Is the site being marketed?</p> <p>Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where, by whom, how much for etc.)</p>	<p>No. The site was marketed in 2018 for a period of circa 6 months, being made available as general employment land. After a marketing campaign lasting 6 months (comprising 2 months of targeted approaches to prospective purchases by the applicants, and 4 months of wider marketing through Arnolds, the agent) there were no viable enquiries made in respect of the site. The site has subsequently lain empty and largely unused, and the landowner has received no enquiries over this further period.</p>	
<p>When might the site be available for development (tick as appropriate)</p>	Immediately	✓
	Within 5 years	✓
	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
<p>Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):</p>		<p><b>Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete, so 15 dwellings per year is presumed.</b></p>
Comments	<p><b>Agent says will take up to 1 year to complete.</b></p>	
<b>Achievability (including viability)</b>		
Comments	<p>Agent says 'The demand for smaller, high quality housing to address the desire for residents in the village to 'downsize' to is well established (see, for example, the supporting text to the Wroxham Neighbourhood Plan policy HBE2). Given the recent issues with nutrient neutrality, there has been a</p>	

	dearth of viable, sustainably located smaller sites for SME developers to bring forward. This site could help to address this demand’.
Overcoming Constraints	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. Adequate visibility from existing access to the south on A1151 Norwich Road is likely to be unachievable.</li> <li>• Major surface water issues / constraints identified which will require further assessment</li> <li>• There are AW assets within the proposed sites – comprising foul sewers. There are easements for many of our underground assets, and the design and layout should ensure that these assets are within public open space or roads and not built over or in private gardens, so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out when necessary.</li> <li>• Development would need to be led by consideration of the immediately adjacent characters which are quite varied</li> <li>• The scale and design will need to be appropriate to the transitional character of the area (sitting between the boatyards and residential area) and the predominant scale of development at the northern end of Staitheway Road, within the conservation area.</li> <li>• The transition between resi and the commercial boating area would need some careful thought, so again boundary treatments and frontages would need consideration and probably some guiding principles written in.</li> <li>• Some consideration would be needed in terms of visibility from the water itself, along with the wider surroundings to guide building heights.</li> <li>• Materials, building heights and overall massing will need to be correctly guided.</li> <li>• 15 apartments could be of a scale and massing that is excessive and incongruous in this location. 15 units could be too many</li> <li>• The site could support protected species namely bats and birds, possibly reptiles and hedgehog.</li> <li>• Any development would have the potential to affect the setting of two designated heritage assets as well as that of the locally identified heritage assets at 35-37 Staitheway Road. The setting of these heritage assets will therefore need to be considered.</li> <li>• Borders a conservation area.</li> <li>• Design will need to consider and enhance the footpath that runs along the southern boundary of the site.</li> <li>• Amenity concerns by bringing residential dwellings near to a boatyard.</li> <li>• Concern re impact of closing both car parks.</li> <li>• Likely need to address contaminated land.</li> <li>• Scheme would need to address overhead lines and substation.</li> <li>• Scheme would need to consider the surface water issues.</li> </ul>


	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GI RAMS – payment likely.</li> <li>• BNG – on site or off-site mitigation.</li> <li>• Nutrient enrichment mitigation.</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 1 year to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. Adequate visibility from existing access to the south on A1151 Norwich Road is likely to be unachievable.</li> <li>• Will closing two car parks result in illegal or inconsiderate parking by those visiting the site?</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for residential development.	

# 15. Land at Marlpit House, Belaugh Green Lane, Coltishall

## 15.1. Map of site

Call for sites - December 2024

Land at Marlpit House Belaugh Green Lane Coltishall



© Broads Authority 2024. © Natural England copyright 2023. © Crown copyright [and database rights] 2024 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.



## 15.2. Photos of site



Looking along the drive to the road access



Showing the house, parking area and garden.



Looking to the eastern part of the garden in front of the house



Looking to the north west of the site.



Showing the western boundary of the site





Looking north, showing the house and parking area



Looking south from the house/parking area



Looking east

### 15.3. Stakeholder comments

Stakeholder	Comments
Broads Authority Development Management Team	This site is reasonably well located in relation to Coltishall so may be acceptable on that basis. The trouble is the site features a fairly sizeable property on a site that has many trees, with the property appearing to be roughly in the middle, and the provision of open amenity space suiting the size of the dwelling. To allow further development on this site would be detrimental to the appearance of the site and its contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, street scene, and adjacent conservation area. Officers do not think this is the kind of application we should be supporting.
Broads Authority Heritage and Design	The site sits immediately adjacent to the grade II listed Coltishall Hall to the west and the Coltishall Conservation Area on two side (the west and south) – both designated heritage assets the setting of which will need to be considered. The site contains a large detached house sitting on a substantial plot, which is characteristic of the area. It also enjoys good tree cover with a number of mature trees.



Stakeholder	Comments
	It may be possible to accommodate a limited amount (one unit) of additional residential accommodation on the site but I would have concerns that two units would be over-development and may also be hard to achieve without damage to the trees which contribute to the character of the area.
Norfolk County Council Heritage	Based on currently available information would not ask for conditions for archaeological work.
Coltishall Parish Council	It was AGREED there are no suitable sites for residential development, gypsy/traveller sites or residential moorings and caravans in the conservation area of Coltishall.
Norfolk County Council Education	<p><b>General Comments, on sites of less than 20 proposed dwellings</b></p> <p>The other sites are deemed suitable to support the existing schools the communities serve and will promote and support the sustainability of the schools in close proximity. Consideration of the impact on walking and cycle routes should be achieved in order to support sustainable modes of transport and reduce families using their motor car where possible.</p>
Broads Authority Landscape Architect	Landscape thoughts are that I wouldn't support it, as although the site and this part of the character area generally is relatively enclosed within mature landscape (and therefore few views are possible), I couldn't support division of the plot. These large plots are characteristic of settlement in the area, and I consider this one is particularly important as its on the edge of the settlement fringe and it does not make sense to further densify urbanisation in this location. I'm aware there are a couple of newer developments in this location to the east beyond Abbey Court along Wroxham Rd and at Llawhaden House (outside the BA administrative area I believe), I believe allocating any sites in this area would lead to later pressure for infill development which would be damaging to the setting of Coltishall.
Norfolk County Council Highways	Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. There is a lack of footway provision. Adequate visibility from access is likely to be unachievable.
Norfolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located within Flood Zone 1 but FZ2 and FZ3 lie in close proximity to the west of the site.</li> <li>• No on-site sewers. Off-site: Foul sewers run along White Lion Road.</li> <li>• Located within Source Protection Zone 3 (SPPZ).</li> <li>• No flood records on-site. Off-site: Flooding records within 500m.</li> <li>• On-site: None. Off-site Surface water flow paths and areas of surface water ponding / pooling within 0.1%, 1% and 3.33% AEP events within 500m of site.</li> <li>• Site lies outside of the Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board area.</li> <li>• No onsite watercourses, however ordinary watercourses (some within the IDB area) and an EA main river located within 100m.</li> <li>• <b>LLFA Assessment: No major surface water issues / constraints identified (Green RAG)</b></li> </ul>

Stakeholder	Comments
Anglian Water Services	<p>The site is within the Belaugh WRC catchment which has dry weather flow headroom available to accommodate the proposed site subject to this being within a reasonable distance to connect to the public sewer.</p> <p>There are no AW assets within the site.</p>
Essex and Suffolk Water	<p>This site is upstream of our water abstraction point at Belaugh and so we would be keen to see careful consideration for water quality in the Bure, with any development proposal. We do not supply water to customers in this area.</p>
Broads Authority Ecologist	<p>From the aerial photos significant mature trees are present on site – these trees and the hedgerows present should be retained and enhanced.</p> <p>The site is likely to support protected species, namely roosting and commuting bats, and nesting birds. Reptiles and hedgehog may also be present.</p> <p>A county wildlife site is less than 100 metres to the south.</p> <p>The site is less than 100 metres from the River Bure, possible water quality issues may arise.</p>

## 15.4. Site assessment

Planning history:

Application number	Description	Decision	Date
BA/2024/0265/HOUSEH	New vehicular entrance and driveway to existing dwelling. Formalising of entrance with hedging, gates and fence	Approve Subject to Conditions	14 Oct 2024

Site address: Land at Marlpit House, Belaugh Green Lane, Coltishall	
<b>Current planning status</b> e.g., with permission, allocated, suggested through the Call for Sites etc.	<b>Suggested through December 2024 call for sites.</b>
<b>Site Size (hectares)</b>	<b>1.31 hectares</b>
<b>Greenfield / Brownfield</b>	<b>Garden land and trees</b>
<b>Ownership (if known)</b> (private/public etc.)	<b>Private</b>
Absolute Constraints Check	
Is the site in a ...	
<b>SPA, SAC, SSSI or Ramsar</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>National Nature Reserve</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Flood risk zone 3b</b>	<b>No - Flood zone 1 according to SFRA</b>

Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	
Statutory Allotments	No	
Locally Designated Green Space	No	
At risk from Coastal Erosion	No	
If yes to any of the above, site will be excluded from further assessment.		
Development Potential (number of dwellings, hectares of employment land or town centre use floor space): 2 dwellings.		
Density calculator	1.53 dwellings per hectare	
Suitability Assessment		
Constraint	Score red/amber/green	Comments
Access to site		Vehicles currently access the site from Belaugh Green Lane down a long driveway. Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. There is a lack of footway provision. Adequate visibility from access is likely to be unachievable.
Accessibility to local services and facilities		1.6km to GP and school. 1.5km to shop. 600m to bus stop, but no peak hour services. No footway for entire length to these services.
Utilities Capacity		Generally acceptable although detail regarding sewerage disposal required. This site is upstream of an Essex and Suffolk water abstraction point at Belaugh and so we would be keen to see careful consideration for water quality in the Bure, with any development proposal.
Utilities Infrastructure		
Contamination and ground stability		
Flood Risk		In flood zone 1. Some surface water flood risk on site.
Coastal Change		
Market Attractiveness		Other than limited services and facilities nearby, has potential to be attractive as a place to visit and live as it is an area in the Broads
Impact	Score red/amber/green	Comments
Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes		To allow further development on this site would be detrimental to the appearance of the site and its contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, street scene, and adjacent conservation area. Site enjoys good tree cover with a number of mature trees. These large plots are
Townscape		

		characteristic of settlement in the area, and this one is particularly important as its on the edge of the settlement fringe and it does not make sense to further densify urbanisation in this location.
Biodiversity and Geodiversity		The site is likely to support protected species, namely roosting and commuting bats, and nesting birds. Reptiles and hedgehog may also be present. Mature trees.
Historic Environment		The site sits immediately adjacent to the grade II listed Coltishall Hall to the west and the Coltishall Conservation Area on two side (the west and south) – both designated heritage assets the setting of which will need to be considered.
Open Space		
Transport and Roads		
Compatibility with neighbouring / adjoining uses		
<b>Local Plan Designations (add further lines as required)</b>		
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Policy reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
None		
<b>Availability Assessment (will require liaison with landowners)</b>		
Is the site being marketed? Add any detail as necessary (e.g., where, by whom, how much for etc.)	No	
When might the site be available for development (tick as appropriate)	Immediately	✓
	Within 5 years	✓
	5-10 years	
	10-15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	
Estimated annual build out rate (including justification):		<b>Agent says will take up to 2 years to complete, so 1 dwelling per year is presumed.</b>
Comments	<b>Agent says will take up to 2 years to complete.</b>	
<b>Achievability (including viability)</b>		
Comments	Agent says: 'The delivery of two self-build plots on the site is achievable for the following reasons: - - Proactive single ownership of land on property that already has residential land use in place; - Self-build plots are highly	

	sought after within the Broads Local Area; - Coltishall achieves high market value and interest and as such will ensure upmost economic viability’.
<b>Overcoming Constraints</b>	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highway Objection to the proposed allocation. There is a lack of footway provision. Adequate visibility from access is likely to be unachievable.</li> <li>• To allow further development on this site would be detrimental to the appearance of the site and its contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, street scene, and adjacent conservation area.</li> <li>• The site is likely to support protected species, namely roosting and commuting bats, and nesting birds. Reptiles and hedgehog may also be present.</li> <li>• Mature trees.</li> <li>• Address setting of heritage assets.</li> <li>• GI RAMS – payment likely.</li> <li>• BNG – on site or off site mitigation.</li> <li>• Nutrient enrichment mitigation required.</li> <li>• Some surface water flood risk on site.</li> <li>• No key services.</li> </ul>
<b>Trajectory of development</b>	
Comments	Delivered after around 5 years, but taking 2 years to develop.
<b>Barriers to Delivery</b>	
Comments	<p>Access to services.</p> <p>Landscape/townscape impact.</p> <p>Highways objection.</p> <p>Adequate visibility from access is likely to be unachievable.</p>
<b>Conclusion (e.g., is included in the theoretical capacity)</b>	
According to the HELAA assessment, the site is not suitable for residential development.	