

<b>Settlement Name:</b>	<b>Lingwood and Burlingham, Beighton and Strumpshaw cluster</b>
<b>Settlement Hierarchy:</b>	<p>Lingwood, together with Beighton and Strumpshaw, forms a village cluster in the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan. The Towards a Strategy document identifies that 2,000 dwellings in total should be provided between all the village clusters. Lingwood has a range of facilities including a primary school, village hall, recreation land, food shop and access to public transport (including a train station). Strumpshaw has a limited range of facilities including a very small parish rooms and a public house, though there is planning permission (20151659) for a new village hall and allotments together with 10 dwellings, originally allocated in the Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan. Beighton has limited service and facilities.</p> <p>The current capacity at Lingwood Primary School is circa 74% and rated as red. This is because forecasts indicate that the spare capacity will be taken up in a few years. Consequently, the scale of housing allocations will be limited to 12-20 dwellings within the cluster.</p> <p>Strumpshaw has a made neighbourhood plan which covers the same area as that of the parish boundary. The Plan was made in July 2014 and covers the period to 2026. It contains a series of policies that look to shape development within the neighbourhood area. There are policies within the plan that will be of relevance to development and any applications that are submitted for development within the parish should have due regard to those policies.</p> <p>At the base date of the plan there are no carried forward residential allocations but there is a total of 44 additional dwellings with planning permission on small sites.</p>

## **STAGE 1 – COMPLETE LIST OF SITES PROMOTED IN THE SETTLEMENT**

### **LIST OF SITES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RESIDENTIAL/MIXED USE ALLOCATION (0.5 HECTARES OR LARGER)**

<b>Address</b>	<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<b>Lingwood and Burlingham</b>			
Land at Lodge Road	GNLP0067	1.97	Mixed-use development comprising an office building providing between 1,500 and 2,000m <sup>2</sup> of office floor space and up to 60m <sup>2</sup> for café, circulation and meeting rooms and up to 15 live/work units.
Land East of Buckenham Lane and West of Buckenham Road	GNLP0296	3.60	Approx. 110 dwellings
Land north of Post Office Road	GNLP0379	1.10	Approx. 27 dwellings
Land west of Blofield Road	GNLP0380	0.91	Approx. 30 dwellings
Land to north of Lodge Lane, Lingwood	GNLP0499	2.91	Approx. 30 dwellings
<b>Strumpshaw</b>			
23 Norwich Road	GNLP0090	0.85	Residential (unspecified number)
Land to the North of Long Lane	GNLP0215	16.09	5-25 dwellings
Mill Lane (South of Norwich Road, North of Buckenham Road)	GNLP0521	3.05	Approx. 90 dwellings
Mill Road	GNLP2017	3.78	Residential (unspecified number)
<b>Beighton</b>			
Land at Southwood Road / Hantons Loke	GNLP0449	2.17	Approx. 36 dwellings
<b>Total area of land</b>		<b>36.43</b>	

**LIST OF SITES TO BE CONSIDERED AS SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY EXTENSIONS (SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY PROPOSALS AND SITES LESS THAN 0.5 HECTARES)**

<b>Address</b>	<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<b>Strumpshaw</b>			
Rear of 33 Norwich Road	GNLPSL0006	0.20	Settlement Boundary
The Huntsman Public House	GNLP0277	0.31	Residential (unspecified number)
Rear of 33 Norwich Road	GNLP2071	0.28	6 dwellings

(Sites of less than 0.5ha are not considered suitable for allocation and therefore have not been assessed in this booklet. These sites will be considered as part of a reappraisal of settlement boundaries to be published with the Regulation 19 Submission version of the Plan).

**LIST OF SITES SUBMITTED FOR OTHER USES**

<b>Address</b>	<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
None			

(Sites submitted for other uses are considered in separate 'Non-Residential' Site Assessment booklets and therefore have not been assessed in this booklet).

## STAGE 2 – HELAA COMPARISON TABLE

### RESIDENTIAL / MIXED USE

	Categories													
	Site access	Access to services	Utilities Capacity	Utilities Infrastructure	Contamination/ ground stability	Flood Risk	Market attractiveness	Significant landscapes	Sensitive townscapes	Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Historic environment	Open Space and GI	Transport & Roads	Compatibility with neighbouring uses
Site Reference														
<b>Lingwood and Burlingham</b>														
GNLP0067	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP0296	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP0379	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP0380	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green
GNLP0499	Green	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green
<b>Strumpshaw</b>														
GNLP0090	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Red	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green
GNLP0215	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber
GNLP0521	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber
GNLP2017	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green
<b>Beighton</b>														
GNLP0449	Green	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green

### **STAGE 3 – SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION COMMENTS**

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Lingwood &amp; Burlingham</b>	
GNLP0067	<p><b>Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council comments</b> The parish council objected but it was approved for 7 live work units and an office block not 15 live work units and an office block.</p>
GNLP0296	<p><b>General comments</b> The development is too large and is in the wrong place. Lack of infrastructure also.</p> <p>This land is grade 1 agricultural and produces high quality crops. Also would destroy a healthy country walk and views.</p> <p>Technical issues are addressed. Buckenham Lane can be widened and the site is in access with key services. Loss of openness but it is contained and the development is in keeping with the village.</p> <p>Comments submitted in support of site. The site is considered suitable for development and additional information has been supplied to support the proposal.</p> <p><b>Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council comments</b> Buckenham Lane and Buckenham Road are single track roads and will be unable to take the extra traffic. There is therefore concern for the safety of pedestrians, particularly the old and young. Danger of flooding. Impacts on wildlife. Infrequent public transport.</p>
GNLP0379	<p><b>Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council comments</b> Site is on the correct side of the village to avoid traffic.</p>
GNLP0380	<p><b>General comments</b> The development would increase flooding at the front of the site. Entrance would be on a blind bend, worsening the current risk. Landscape setting would be adversely affected and the site has topographical issues. Blafield Road is a single track. The higher housing density would compare badly to Neve's Close.</p> <p><b>Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council comments</b> Comments submitted in support of site. The site is considered suitable for development as it will have no impact on traffic levels in the village.</p>
GNLP0499	<p><b>General comments</b> Objections raised regarding the large scale and too far outside of the development boundary.</p>

## Strumpshaw

GNLP0090	<p><b>General comments</b>          Objections raised on the ground of concerns regarding inadequate infrastructure in sewerage, surface water, drainage, poor highway facilities and infrequent public transport. Other concerns include loss of agricultural land, poor effect on local services. The neighbourhood plan identified the site as informal green open space, important to maintain the character of the village. Strumpshaw has little employment no school or shops.</p> <p><b>Strumpshaw Parish Council comments</b>          Strumpshaw Parish Council objects: Policy 6 of Strumpshaw's Neighbourhood Plan seeks to protect this site as green space. It is believed that there is a former pit on the site and there would be drainage issues</p>
GNLP0215	<p><b>General comments</b>          Objections raised concerning the village has no amenities, no local shop, and no post office causing travel into neighbouring villages. This leads to traffic congestion and enforce dependency on cars as alternative transport is very limited. The site is outside the settlement limit and the scale will impact the surrounding landscape and townscape of the village known to have high agricultural and ecological importance.</p> <p><b>Strumpshaw Parish Council comments</b>          Strumpshaw Parish Council objects; highways access would be difficult with poor visibility exiting onto this twisty road. Development on this site would erode the open space between settlement areas, which the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to maintain.</p>
GNLP0521	<p><b>General comments</b>          Objections raised concerning the village has no amenities, no local shop, and no post office causing travel into neighbouring villages. This leads to traffic congestion and enforce dependency on cars as alternative transport is very limited. The site is outside the settlement limit and the scale will impact the surrounding landscape and townscape of the village known to have high agricultural and ecological importance. Access is via backroads and not viable for the modern car. Other concerns include sewerage, surface water drainage, poor highway facilities and infrequent public transport.</p> <p><b>Strumpshaw Parish Council comments</b>          Strumpshaw Parish Council objects: Mill Lane/Mill Road is single track road with no footway. It is also believed that there are former gravel workings on this site which would make it unsuitable. A development of this proposed size would be unacceptable to a</p>

	very small village and would overwhelm the rest of the village and would be contrary to Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan.
GNLP2017	<b>Strumpshaw Parish Council comments</b> Strumpshaw Parish Council objects strongly to this proposal. Mill Road is single track so is unsuitable for additional housing. The village has no shop, no school, only one pub and very limited public transport. The site is outside the Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan.
<b>Beighton</b>	
GNLP0449	<b>General comments</b> Objections raised concerns regarding no amenities or facilities, no school, bus service or trains and part of this site has been kept for wildlife and would like it kept that way. Other concerns include road safety, poor visibility when turning out of properties on Southwood Road and changing Brighton from a rural setting to a housing estate.  <b>Beighton Parish Council comments</b> Beighton Parish Council objects to this site. Beighton is a village with no facilities, no school, no shop, little public transport and dangerous traffic speeds on High Road and Southwood Road. It would be inappropriate to build on this site.

#### **STAGE 4 – DISCUSSION OF SUBMITTED SITES**

In this section sites are assessed in order to establish whether they are suitable for allocation. For the purposes of Sustainability Appraisal, suitable sites are those which are considered to be Reasonable Alternatives. Sites not considered suitable for allocation are not realistic options and therefore are not considered to be reasonable alternatives. The discussion below outlines the reasons why a site has been deemed suitable or unsuitable for allocation. By association this is also the outline of the reasons why a site was deemed to be a reasonable or unreasonable alternative.

A range of factors have been taken into account to establish whether a site should, or should not, be considered suitable for allocation. These factors include: impact on heritage and landscape; impact on the form and character of the settlement; relationship to services and facilities; environmental concerns, including flood risk; and, in particular, a safe walking route to a primary school. Sites which do not have a safe walking route to school, or where a safe walking route cannot be created will not be considered suitable for allocation.

**Conclusions in regard to a sites performance against the relevant factors have also been informed by the outcomes of the HELAA, as set out under stage 2, consultation responses received, as summarised in stage 3, and other relevant evidence**

Five sites have been put forward for consideration in Lingwood and Burlingham parish, four in Strumpshaw and one in Beighton. Because of capacity constraints at the primary school a limited amount of development of circa 12-20 dwellings is sought.

Lingwood

Sites GNLP0499 and GNLP0067 are located at the extreme north-eastern edge of the settlement of Lingwood, with GNLP0499 to the north of Lodge Lane particularly being divorced from the settlement and would appear as a separate enclave if developed. Access into the village would be along a relatively busy road without footways. Both sites are within Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1. GNLP0499 would also accommodate significantly more dwellings than required. There is also some risk of surface water flooding, particularly to GNLP0067. Site GNLP 0067 is proposed for 15 live work units and offices, expanding on the existing planning permission for 7 live work units and offices. This permission was given “on appeal” with the applicants suggesting that there was an unmet demand for this type of live work units in the area. To-date no units have been delivered which perhaps indicates that the level of demand was not as high as envisaged. Irrespective of this the permission remains and if there is a higher level of demand that arises then this could be addressed through the submission of a new planning application. But on the basis of the current evidence there is not sufficient grounds or need to allocate the site as requested. GNLP0499 and GNLP0067 are not short-listed as reasonable alternatives.

Site GNLP0379 is centrally located in Lingwood and of a relatively small size (1.1 ha) but sufficient to accommodate the scale of development proposed for the cluster. There is a safe route to Lingwood Primary Academy. It is within Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 and so sequentially preferred to Grade 1 land. There is a surface water flooding risk in the south-west corner of the site which might limit the developable area, and there are views towards St Peter’s church to the north. These issues would need to be taken into account but site GNLP0379 is short-listed as a reasonable alternative.

Site GNLP0380 is located on the western edge of Lingwood to the west of Blofield Road with a safe route to Lingwood Primary Academy. It is a relatively small size but sufficient to accommodate the scale of development proposed for the cluster. It is within Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 and so sequentially preferred to Grade 1 land. There is a surface water flooding risk along the eastern part of the site which might limit the developable area. The potential loss of views of the open countryside to the west is a consideration. These issues would need to be taken into account but site GNLP0380 is short-listed as a reasonable alternative.

Site GNLP0296 is located to the south-west of Lingwood. It is a larger site that could accommodate considerably more dwellings than required. It is within Agricultural



Land Classification Grade 2 and so sequentially preferred to Grade 1 land. There is a surface water flooding risk to the south-west of the site which might limit the developable area. A short section of footpath improvements would be required along Buckenham Lane to create a safe route to school but this is worthy of further consideration. These issues would need to be taken into account but site GNLP0296 is short-listed as a reasonable alternative.

### Strumpshaw

In Strumpshaw all the promoted sites are within Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 and so sequentially preferred to Grade 1 land, though the sites behind the Huntsman Public House (GNLP0277, GNLP2071 and GNLP0006) are not currently agricultural land. A very large site, GNLP0215, located to the west of the settlement, would accommodate substantially more dwellings than are required. This site would also be a considerable distance from the main facilities in Lingwood, much further than other sites, and with only intermittent footways along the Norwich Road. The potential loss of views of the open countryside to the west is also a consideration. There would also be a conflict with policy 2 of the Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to protect the gap between Strumpshaw and the part of Strumpshaw parish adjacent to Brundall. Consequently, GNLP0215 is not short-listed as a reasonable alternative.

Sites GNLP2017 and GNLP0521 are located to the south of Strumpshaw and are a little divorced from the settlement, accessed off a narrow road, and distant from the main facilities in Lingwood. They could also accommodate substantially more dwellings than are required. Site GNLP0090 is more centrally located, but has a substantial area at risk of surface water flooding to the north of the site, adjacent to Norwich Road. It is also identified as a key green feature to be protected under Policy 6 of the Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan. Also, access to the facilities in Lingwood, including the school, would be along the eastern part of Norwich Road, which is a relatively busy road and without footways until the edge of the village after the Huntsman PH. Consequently, sites GNLP2017, GNLP0521 and GNLP0090 are not short-listed as reasonable alternatives.

### Beighton

In the parish of Beighton site GNLP0449, to the north of Southwood Road, is poorly located to access the facilities of Lingwood or elsewhere, in terms of distance and lack of footways, with few facilities available in Beighton itself. Consequently, GNLP0449 is not short-listed as a reasonable alternative.

**STAGE 5 – SHORTLIST OF REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE SITES FOR FURTHER ASSESSMENT**

Based on the assessment undertaken at stage 4 above the following sites are considered to be reasonable alternatives.

<b>Address</b>	<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<b>Lingwood &amp; Burlingham</b>			
Land East of Buckenham Lane and West of Buckenham Road	GNLP0296	3.60	Approx. 110 dwellings.
Land north of Post Office Road	GNLP0379	1.10	Approx. 27 dwellings.
Land west of Blofield Road	GNLP0380	0.91	Approx. 30 dwellings.
<b>Total area of land</b>		<b>5.61</b>	

**STAGE 6 – DETAILED SITE ASSESSMENTS OF REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE SITES**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP0296
<b>Address:</b>	Land East of Buckenham Lane and West of Buckenham Road
<b>Proposal:</b>	Residential development of approx. 110 dwellings.

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Agriculture	Greenfield

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<p><b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b>          Access, Accessibility to Services, Utilities Capacity, Flood Risk, Significant Landscape, Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity and Transport &amp; Roads.</p>
<p><b>HELAA Conclusion</b>          The largest site promoted in Lingwood, it lies to the south-west, adjacent to existing development and with some walkable access to services. Initial highway evidence has indicated that a suitable access could be achieved, and that any impact on local roads could be mitigated. It is likely that the water supply and sewerage infrastructure network, including the water recycling centre, would need to be upgraded. There are no known constraints from utilities infrastructure, contamination or ground instability, and there would be no loss of public open space. There are areas within the site at risk of surface water flooding, and the site is in agricultural land class 2. There would be no impact on designated landscapes, conservation areas or ecological sites, but development of the site may reduce the gap between Lingwood and Strumpshaw and affect the setting of locally designated heritage assets. Although the site has some constraints, it is considered suitable for the land availability assessment.</p>

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<p><b>Highways</b>          No. 110 dwellings. Buckenham La too narrow for 5.5m carriageway plus footway. Good visibility splays from Buckenham Rd to Norwich Rd. Highway slightly constrained, might be <b>challenging to deliver adequately wide carriageway &amp; footway.</b></p>
<p><b>Development Management</b></p>

Large site with potential access issues which would need to be considered further by the Highway Authority. Some landscape impact but not likely to be significant subject to good design and incorporation of informal rural edge/POS

**Minerals & Waste**

No safeguarded mineral resources

**Lead Local Flood Authority**

Mitigation required for heavy constraints. Significant information required at a planning stage. RoSWF mapping indicates that a surface water flow path develops in the 0.1% event connecting, isolated ponding from the 1% event. The LLFA have a number of reports of flooding downstream of this flow path, so any development would need to robustly explain how the development of the site and management of surface water would be undertaken to ensure that the risk downstream was not negatively impacted on. There are no watercourses near the site but the proximity to an existing residential area indicates that there may be sewerage connections available.

**PLANNING HISTORY:**

None

**BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION**

- Site Layout Plan

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP0379
<b>Address:</b>	Land north of Post Office Road Post Office Road
<b>Proposal:</b>	Residential development of approx. 27 dwellings and associated landscaping accessed from Post Office Road.

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Agricultural	Greenfield

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<p><b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b>  Access, Accessibility to Services, Utilities Capacity, Flood Risk, Significant Landscapes, Townscapes, Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity, Historic Environment and Transport &amp; Roads.</p>
<p><b>HELAA Conclusion</b>  The site is in the north of the village, adjacent to housing and opposite Lingwood village green. It has walkable access to services and initial highway evidence has indicated that a suitable access could be achieved, and that any impact on local roads could be mitigated. It is likely that the sewerage infrastructure network would need to be upgraded. There are no known constraints from utilities infrastructure, contamination or ground instability, and there would be no loss of public open space. There are areas within the site at risk of surface water flooding, and the site is in agricultural land classes 1 and 2. There would be no impact on designated landscapes, conservation areas or ecological sites, but development of the site may affect the setting of some listed buildings. Although the site has some constraints, it is considered suitable for the land availability assessment.</p>

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<p><b>Highways</b>  Yes. 27 dwellings - Subject to removal of bank &amp; trees to achieve acceptable visibility, carriageway widening to 5.5m, 2.0m frontage footway and pedestrian improvements to Post Office Road/Post Office Close junction.  <i>60 dwellings might be pushing it as Post Office Road is not a very good standard, is there any possibility that the site could be extended westwards over the whole frontage? That would enable road widening to an acceptable 6.0m (it appears PO Road is a bus route) Frontage development would change the feel of the road and encourage reduced vehicle speeds despite the effect of widening.</i> Email Highways 13/6/19</p> <p><b>Development Management</b></p>

Potential landscape impact with views impacted towards the Grade I listed church. Also, townscape issues with erosion of the rural character. Potential highway issues with Post Office Road due to it being narrow in places.

**Minerals & Waste**

No safeguarded mineral resources

**Lead Local Flood Authority**

Few or no Constraints. Significant information required at a planning stage. RofSW mapping indicates that the site is affected by a surface water flow path in all return periods. In the 3.33% event the flow path appears mostly on the boundary of the site. In subsequent events there is a greater ingress into the site. The flow path affects the eastern side of the site to a depth of 0.3m. There is no watercourse near the site, but the location adjacent to an existing residential area suggests that sewer connections may be available. If not drainage of the site will be reliant on the results of infiltration testing.

**PLANNING HISTORY:**

No relevant history

**BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION**

No additional documents submitted to support this proposal.

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP0380
<b>Address:</b>	Land west of Blofield Road
<b>Proposal:</b>	Residential development comprising approx. 30 dwellings and associated landscaping accessed from Blofield Road.

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Agricultural	Greenfield

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<p><b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b> Access, Accessibility to Services, Utilities Capacity, Flood Risk, Significant Landscape. Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity and Transport &amp; Roads.</p>
<p><b>HELAA Conclusion</b> The site lies to the west of the village, adjacent to and opposite housing. It has walkable access to services and initial highway evidence has indicated that a suitable access could be achieved, and that any impact on local roads could be mitigated. It is likely that the sewerage infrastructure network would need to be upgraded. There are no known constraints from utilities infrastructure, contamination or ground instability, and there would be no loss of public open space. There are areas at the site boundary at risk of surface water flooding, and the site is in agricultural land class 2. There would be no impact on designated landscapes, conservation areas or ecological sites, but development of the site may affect the setting of the church. Although the site has some constraints, it is considered suitable for the land availability assessment.</p>

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<p><b>Highways</b> Yes. 30 dwellings. Frontage footway required, may need removal of significant mature tree to facilitate visibility. Possible speed limit enhancement required to manage down speeds at frontage. Would need visible frontage development to create sense of place re vehicle speeds.</p>
<p><b>Development Management</b> Issues with location at gateway to village and shape of site may prove problematic - can a good layout be achieved bearing in mind its size, shape and the number of dwellings to be provided. Can access/visibility be achieved?</p>
<p><b>Minerals &amp; Waste</b> No safeguarded mineral resources</p>
<p><b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b></p>

Few or no Constraints. Significant information required at a planning stage. RofSW mapping indicates that the site is affected by a surface water flow path that develops in the 0.1% event. The flow path affects the southwest corner of the site to a depth of 0.3m. There is no watercourse near the site, but the location adjacent to an existing residential area suggests that sewer connections may be available. If not drainage of the site will be reliant on the results of infiltration testing.

**PLANNING HISTORY:**

No History

**BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION**

No additional documents submitted to support this proposal.



**STAGE 7 – SETTLEMENT BASED APPRAISAL OF REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE SITES AND IDENTIFICATION OF PREFERRED SITE/S (WHERE APPROPRIATE).**

Three reasonable alternative sites have been identified in the Lingwood and Burlingham, Beighton and Strumpshaw cluster at stage 5. These sites were considered to be worthy of further investigation to look at their potential for allocation as the initial assessment did not flag up any major constraints that would preclude allocation. These sites have been subject to further discussion with Development Management, Highways, Flood Authority and Children’s Services in order to identify preferred sites for allocation and their comments are recorded under stage six above. As part of this further discussion it was agreed that site GNLP0379 was the most appropriate site for allocation as it is centrally located in the village and has a safe walking route to Lingwood Primary School. GNLP0379 is proposed to be allocated on a larger boundary than submitted to allow for a linear parkland to be provided to the north to mitigate impact on the Grade I Listed church. This larger boundary is supported by highways as it would enable highway mitigations to take place. Space at Lingwood Primary School is forecast to be taken up in future years but Norfolk County Council (as education authority) has indicated they would accept development in the order of 50-60 new homes to enable a well designed development to come forward.

Sites GNLP0296 and GNLP0380 are considered to be reasonable alternatives. They are both considered to be good sites for development but are not proposed for allocation at the current time as the capacity for the cluster has already been met and exceeded on the preferred site.

In conclusion, one site is identified as a preferred option, providing for between 50-60 new homes in the cluster. There are no carried forward residential allocations but there is a total of 44 additional dwellings with planning permission on small sites. This gives a total deliverable housing commitment for the cluster of between 94 – 104 homes between 2018 – 2038.

**Preferred Sites:**

Address	Site Reference	Area (Ha)	Proposal	Reason for allocating
<b>Lingwood and Burlingham, Beighton and Strumpshaw</b>				
Land north of Post Office Road	GNLP0379 (larger site)	4.74	50 - 60 dwellings (and open space)	This site is proposed for allocation but over a larger area than submitted. This larger allocation would enable open space to be provided to mitigate impact on the nearby Grade I Listed Church, potentially in the form of a linear parkland to the north. The site is centrally

Address	Site Reference	Area (Ha)	Proposal	Reason for allocating
				located in the village, adjacent to the existing settlement limit and has a safe walking route to Lingwood Primary School. A larger site, along the whole road frontage, would enable road widening to an acceptable standard and encourage a reduction in vehicle speeds.

**Reasonable Alternative Sites:**

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Comments
<b>Lingwood and Burlingham, Beighton and Strumpshaw</b>				
Land east of Buckenham Lane and west of Buckenham Road	GNLP0296	3.60	Approx. 110 dwellings	This site is considered to be a reasonable alternative as it is well located in relation to the form and character of Lingwood with the possibility of vehicular access from Buckenham Road. There is an area of surface water flood risk to the south west of the site which may limit the developable area. The site is not preferred for allocation as there is considered to be a better site in Lingwood to meet the capacity of the cluster.
Land west of Blofield Road	GNLP0380	0.91	Approx. 30 dwellings	This site is considered to be a reasonable alternative as it would act as a gateway site into the village creating a sense of place although some mature trees may need to be removed to facilitate visibility in/out of the site. The site is not preferred for allocation as there is considered to be a better site in Lingwood to meet the capacity of the cluster.

**Unreasonable Sites:**

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason considered to be unreasonable
<b>Lingwood and Burlingham, Beighton and Strumpshaw</b>				
Land at Lodge Road, Lingwood	GMLP0067	1.97	Mixed use development comprising office, café, meeting rooms and up to 15 live/work units	This site is located at the extreme north-eastern edge of the settlement with some surface water flood risk. The proposal is to expand the existing planning permission given on appeal from 7 to 15 live work units and offices which to date has not been delivered. If a high level of demand arises for these types of units then this could be considered through a new planning application but there is no current evidence of need to warrant allocation of the site for the proposed uses. Access into the village would be along a relatively busy road without footways therefore there is no safe walking route to Lingwood Primary School.
23 Norwich Road, Strumpshaw	GMLP0090	0.85	Residential (unspecified number)	This site is centrally located within Strumpshaw but access to facilities in Lingwood, including the school would be along Norwich Road which is relatively busy without footways until the edge of the village after the Huntsman Public House. There is a substantial area of surface water flood risk to the north of the site and it is identified

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason considered to be unreasonable
				as a key green feature to be protected in the Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan.
Land to the north of Long Lane, Strumpshaw	GNLP0215	16.09	5-25 dwellings	This is a very large site located to the west of the Strumpshaw which if developed in its entirety would be contrary to the form and character of the village. The site is some distance from the main facilities in Lingwood, including the school, with only intermittent footways along Norwich Road. There is conflict with the Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to protect the gap between Strumpshaw and Brundall.
Land at Southwood Road/Hantons Loke, Beighton	GNLP0449	2.17	Approx. 36 dwellings	This site is considered to be unreasonable for allocation as it is poorly located to access facilities in Lingwood or elsewhere, in terms of distance and lack of footways. There is no safe pedestrian route to Lingwood Primary School. There are few facilities available in Beighton itself which has no settlement limit.
Land to the north of Lodge Lane, Lingwood	GNLP0499	2.91	Approx. 30 dwellings	This site is considered to be unreasonable as it is divorced from the existing settlement and would appear as a separate enclave if developed contrary to the form and character of the village. Access into the village would be along a

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason considered to be unreasonable
				relatively busy road without footways therefore there is no safe walking route to Lingwood Primary School.
Mill Lane (South of Norwich Road, North of Buckenham Road), Strumpshaw	GNLP0521	3.05	Approx. 90 dwellings	This site is located to the south of Strumpshaw, divorced from the settlement and distant from the main facilities in Lingwood including the school with no safe pedestrian route. Vehicular access is down a narrow road which is unlikely to be acceptable in highway terms.
Mill Road, Strumpshaw	GNLP2017	3.78	Residential (unspecified number)	This site is located to the south of Strumpshaw, divorced from the settlement and distant from the main facilities in Lingwood including the school with no safe pedestrian route. Vehicular access is down a narrow road which is unlikely to be acceptable in highway terms.

