

<b>Settlement Name:</b>	<b>Rackheath</b>
<b>Settlement Hierarchy:</b>	<p>Rackheath forms part of an area identified for significant growth in the JCS referred to as the Old Catton, Sprowston Rackheath, Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle where land is allocated through the OSRT Growth Triangle AAP. NB the GNLP will not supersede the AAP document – the allocations at GT16 – GT19 are therefore not available for comment in the GNLP public consultation. Rackheath is classified as an urban fringe parish in the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan.</p> <p>Currently Rackheath is a predominantly rural parish with a population of approximately 2,000. The OSRT GT as a whole has a commitment of approx. 12,500 dwellings, including approx. 3,200 in Rackheath. The Towards a Strategy Document considers this commitment and therefore specifies 200 dwellings as an indicative figure for new allocations in the north-east sector to be spread across Rackheath, Sprowston and Thorpe. For Rackheath the strategy considers potential smaller sites and uplift in existing allocations but questions how much could be delivered in the plan period or post-2036?</p> <p>Current facilities in the village include a primary school, a local shop and post office, a pub and a village hall although there are also new facilities planned into the large-scale development commitments such as a new healthcare facility, two new schools, etc. (policy GT16).</p> <p>Rackheath Neighbourhood Plan (July 2017) 2017-2037 provides additional policies for future development, however, it does not allocate any sites for development. The vision for the Neighbourhood Plan is that by 2037 Rackheath will be a small attractive rural town with a village feel, developed in a way that is sensitive to its rural location and heritage. It will have a strong and vibrant resident community and thriving local businesses. There will be an excellent range of services and facilities with good connections within Rackheath and between it and other settlements. It will be a place where people want to live, work and get involved, now and for future generations.</p>

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

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

<b>Address</b>	<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<b>Rackheath</b>			
Land to the East of Salhouse Road	GNLP0095	5.27	Up to 8 dwellings off of a private drive
Land to the west of Green Lane West, Rackheath	GNLP0172	11.44	Residential (unspecified number)
Heathwood Gospel Hall, Green Lane West	GNLP0351	0.75	Residential (unspecified number)
Land east of Green Lane West	GNLP0478	44.60	Residential development of 142 open market and affordable dwellings with 31.78ha of green infrastructure in the form of a Country Park and recreation ground
Land east of Back Lane	GNLP1029	0.81	Approx. 20 self-build plots
Land south of Dobb's Lane	GNLP1030	2.81	84 dwellings
Land to the south of Swash Lane and Muck Lane	GNLP1060	24.73	Relocation of Wroxham Football club with mixed use development of residential and commercial
North-east of Green Lane West	GNLP2037	1.04	10 dwellings
South of Salhouse Road	GNLP2092	20.84	Residential (unspecified number)
South of Warren Road	GNLP2166	12.94	216 dwellings plus GI
<b>Total area of land</b>		<b>125.23</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>
None			

(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

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Proposal
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														
Rackheath														
GNLP0095	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber
GNLP0172	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber
GNLP0351	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Amber
GNLP0478	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Amber
GNLP1029	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Amber
GNLP1030	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber
GNLP1060	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Amber
GNLP2037	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
GNLP2092	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Amber
GNLP2166	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	Green	Green	Green	Green

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

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Rackheath</b>	
GNLP0095	<p><b>General comments</b> Residential developments are better in the built-up area of the village to allow access to facilities. This site as marked as part of GI corridor. The site does not comply with the Neighbourhood Plan which states that new development will respect the integrity of the village. Coalescence of villages should be avoided.</p> <p><b>Rackheath Parish Council comments</b> No new sites should be allocated until all current allocations are developed. Concerns about impact to community, infrastructure and green space.</p> <p><b>Sprowston Town Council comments</b> Sprowston Town Council were opposed to this site (GNLP0095) due to its isolation from existing communities.</p>
GNLP0172	<p><b>General comments</b> Permanent residence is better suited within the built up area of the village allowing good access to community facilities and school. This area was marked as part of the green corridor e.g. not subject to housing in local plans.</p> <p>The site is available and deliverable. There are no 'red' scores for the site. The assessment is challenged on access, access to services, utilities, flood risk, landscape impact and compatibility with neighbouring uses. We request the site assessment is amended appropriately.</p> <p><b>Rackheath Parish Council comments</b> No new sites should be allocated for house building in Rackheath until all the current 3,600 housing allocations have been developed. Concerns about impact of mass development to local community, infrastructure and to green space.</p> <p><b>Salhouse Parish Council comments</b> Considering the proposed sites for Rackheath, site numbers GNLP 0095, 2166, 2092 and 2040 will all contribute to the effect of continuous development from the Norwich city boundary to Salhouse, especially if the earlier sites nos. GNLP 0487 (now Planning Application 20170243), 0493, 0164 and 0163 were all allowed to go ahead within the Salhouse parish boundary. Development of these sites would conflict with Policy 2 of the JCS and Broadland Policy EN 2 as it would fail to maintain the strategic gap between the communities of Sprowston and Rackheath and Rackheath and Salhouse respectively, and would damage the landscape settings of</p>

	<p>the two villages and their approaches. It would also conflict with <b>Policy GT 2 Green Infrastructure</b> of the Broadland North East Growth Triangle AAP which seeks to protect an area either side of the NDR from inappropriate development. Various other proposed sites in Rackheath also conflict with this policy.</p> <p><b>Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council comments</b> The parish council objects to this site allocation as it does not comply with Policy 1 of the Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan. Which states 'New development will respect and retain the integrity of Great Plumstead, Little Plumstead and Thorpe End Garden Village as distinct character as individual villages and it is important that coalescence is avoided between Thorpe End Garden Village and development related to the surrounding settlements, ensuring that Thorpe End Garden Village retains the appearance and character of a separate garden village"'.</p>
GNLP0351	<p><b>General comments</b> The village cannot cope with more homes until extra infrastructure is in place. There is already too much development.</p> <p>Alternative uses are being considered on consultation. Site plan available.</p> <p><b>Rackheath Parish Council comments</b> No new sites should be allocated for house building in Rackheath until all the current 3,600 housing allocation has been developed. Concerns about impact of mass development to local community, infrastructure and to green space.</p>
GNLP0478	<p><b>General comments</b> The village cannot cope with more homes until extra infrastructure is in place. There is already too much development. There are concerns about the impact on the community, infrastructure and green space.</p> <p>This 300-dwelling site is promoted as a strategic housing development. The scheme enables the delivery of the Rackheath Country Park. The site is in the Growth Triangle of the Norwich Policy Area.</p> <p><b>Rackheath Parish Council comments</b> No new sites should be allocated for house building in Rackheath until all the current 3,600 housing allocation has been developed. Concerns about impact of mass development to local community, infrastructure and to green space.</p>
GNLP1029	<p><b>General comments</b> Previous planning permission for this site was refused. Old Rackheath was subject to a no new build policy. The site has no</p>

	<p>drainage/gas and is prime agricultural land. Vehicle access is severely restricted. There are no amenities and views will be lost.</p> <p><b>Rackheath Parish Council comments</b> No new sites should be allocated for house building in Rackheath until all the current 3,600 housing allocation has been developed. Concerns about impact of mass development to local community, infrastructure and to green space.</p>
GNLP1030	<p><b>General comments</b> Previous planning permission for this site was refused. Old Rackheath was subject to a no new build policy. The site has no drainage/gas and is prime agricultural land. Vehicle access is severely restricted. There are no amenities.</p> <p><b>Rackheath Parish Council comments</b> No sites should be allocated until all current allocations have been developed. There are concerns about the impact to the local community, infrastructure and green space.</p>
GNLP1060	<p><b>General comments</b> There isn't detail on the number of homes. No sites should be allocated until all current allocations have been developed. There are concerns about the impact to the local community, infrastructure and green space.</p> <p>Norfolk FA support this site if Wroxham FC move sites to Muck Lane / Swash Lane.</p> <p><b>Rackheath Parish Council comments</b> No new sites should be allocated for house building in Rackheath until all the current 3,600 housing allocation has been developed. Concerns about impact of mass development to local community, infrastructure and to green space.</p>
GNLP2037	No comments
GNLP2092	<p><b>Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council comments</b> The development is outside of the settlement boundary. The site allocation does not comply with Policy 1 of the Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan which states 'New development will respect and retain the integrity of Great Plumstead, Little Plumstead and Thorpe End Garden Village as distinct character as individual villages and, in particular, it is important that coalescence is avoided between Thorpe End Garden Village and development related to the surrounding settlements, ensuring that Thorpe End Garden Village retains the appearance and character of a separate garden village"</p>

	<p><b>Salhouse Parish Council comments</b>          Considering the proposed sites for Rackheath, site numbers GNLP 0095, 2166, 2092 and 2040 will all contribute to the effect of continuous development from the Norwich city boundary to Salhouse, especially if the earlier sites nos. GNLP 0487 (now Planning Application 20170243), 0493, 0164 and 0163 were all allowed to go ahead within the Salhouse parish boundary. Development of these sites would conflict with Policy 2 of the JCS and Broadland Policy EN 2 as it would fail to maintain the strategic gap between the communities of Sprowston and Rackheath and Rackheath and Salhouse respectively, and would damage the landscape settings of the two villages and their approaches. It would also conflict with Policy GT 2 Green Infrastructure of the Broadland North East Growth Triangle AAP which seeks to protect an area either side of the NDR from inappropriate development. Various other proposed sites in Rackheath also conflict with this policy.</p> <p><b>Norfolk Wildlife Trust comments</b>          We note the proximity of this site to Paine's Yard Wood, The Owlery &amp; March Covert CWS and are concerned at the potential ecological impacts of housing in this location. Should this site be progressed to the next consultation stage, then we would expect it to be accompanied by further details demonstrating how it would be deliverable without resulting in damage to adjoining areas of ecological value, for example through providing sufficient stand-off between development and priority habitats, and where proportional the provision of green infrastructure to ensure that the site has a net benefit for biodiversity.</p>
GNLP2166	<p><b>Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council comments</b>          The development is outside of the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The site allocation does not comply with Policy 1 of the Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan which states 'New development will respect and retain the integrity of Great Plumstead, Little Plumstead and Thorpe End Garden Village as distinct character as individual villages and, in particular, it is important that coalescence is avoided between Thorpe End Garden Village and development related to the surrounding settlements, ensuring that Thorpe End Garden Village retains the appearance and character of a separate garden village"</p> <p><b>Salhouse Parish Council comments</b>          Considering the proposed sites for Rackheath, site numbers GNLP 0095, 2166, 2092 and 2040 will all contribute to the effect of continuous development from the Norwich city boundary to Salhouse, especially if the earlier sites nos. GNLP 0487 (now Planning Application 20170243), 0493, 0164 and 0163 were all allowed to go ahead within the Salhouse parish boundary. Development of these sites would conflict with Policy 2 of the JCS and Broadland Policy EN</p>



2 as it would fail to maintain the strategic gap between the communities of Sprowston and Rackheath and Rackheath and Salhouse respectively, and would damage the landscape settings of the two villages and their approaches. It would also conflict with Policy GT 2 Green Infrastructure of the Broadland North East Growth Triangle AAP which seeks to protect an area either side of the NDR from inappropriate development. Various other proposed sites in Rackheath also conflict with this policy.

**Norfolk Wildlife Trust comments**

We note the proximity of this site to Paine's Yard Wood, The Owlery & March Covert CWS and are concerned at the potential ecological impacts of housing in this location. Should this site be progressed to the next consultation stage, then we would expect it to be accompanied by further details demonstrating how it would be deliverable without resulting in damage to adjoining areas of ecological value, for example through providing sufficient stand-off between development and priority habitats, and where proportional the provision of green infrastructure to ensure that the site has a net benefit for biodiversity.

## **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.**

Ten sites have been proposed for future housing development in Rackheath in three main clusters described below. General considerations for the parish are potential impacts to ecology and biodiversity, especially the Broads Authority area to the north. Rackheath does not have a historic core, but there are heritage assets associated with the former air base. Land on the southern side of the Northern Distributor Road is reserved as a landscape buffer (Policy GT2, which is not subject to this consultation), with Rackheath Hall and its historic parkland being emphasised in the ORST Growth Triangle AAP.

There are four sites promoted to the west of Rackheath Industrial Estate. In accessibility terms the parts of these sites with the most development potential are generally those closest to Green Lane West with potential safe access to the Primary School. Taking account of the consultation comments received, existing commitment, HELAA constraints and achieving safe access to school the following sites are considered to be reasonable alternatives:

### **GNLP0478**

This land west of Green Lane West and east of the Industrial Estate totals 31.78 hectares for 142 dwellings plus land south east of the NDR for Green Infrastructure in the form of a Country Park, including a cricket ground with changing rooms and carparking. Land proposed for residential use is to the west of Green Lane West adjacent to Stracey Sports Park, which includes some football pitches. There is potential to consider this site in combination with other sites put forward for development along Green Lane West, which is paved and could provide a safe

pedestrian route to Rackheath Primary School. Constraints are identified as potential contamination, surface water flood risk, impact from neighbouring uses (e.g. industrial estate), noise associated with the NDR and impact on landscape character and Rackheath Hall to the south. There may be potential to mitigate these impacts so the site is considered to be a reasonable alternative.

#### GNLP0172

Site 0172 is located west of Green Lane West and is promoted as two parcels of land bisected by the NDR. Residential development on the land to the west of Green Lane, adjacent to the existing settlement limit could be seen as sympathetic to the character of the area as there is already residential development to the north of the site and a mix of development to the south. Furthermore, on the opposite side of the road is GT16, an extensive mixed-use allocation. Green Lane West is paved and could provide a safe pedestrian route to Rackheath Primary School. A section across the middle of site is affected by surface water flood risk and there is potential contamination but as there is potential to mitigate these constraints the site to the north of the NDR is considered to be a reasonable alternative. The part of the site to the south of the NDR is not considered to be reasonable as it is located within the NDR landscape buffer (GT2, which is not subject to comment in this consultation) and close to the Historic Gardens of Rackheath Hall, a grade II listed building. It is considered to be unsympathetic to the landscape character of the area and disconnected from existing development by the NDR.

#### GNLP0351

This is a smaller site at Plymouth Brethren Christian Church, off Green Lane West proposed for residential development. This is a brownfield site within the settlement limit where development is acceptable in principle provided that it does not result in any significant adverse impact. The site is well located to the existing village, with industrial units to the rear, frontage development further down the road and mixed use allocation GT16 opposite. Constraints on the site for residential development are relatively few, although the proximity of small industrial units to the rear is a consideration and some mitigations to manage the compatibility of neighbouring uses may be necessary. This site is considered to be a reasonable alternative.

#### GNLP2037

This site off Green Avenue West is within the settlement limit where development is accepted in principle provided that it does not result in any significant adverse impact. The site is well located opposite frontage development with further development to the south east and north. It also borders a major mixed use allocation GT16 (which is not subject to this consultation). The site is mostly greenfield but there are some existing structures that would need to be demolished. Given the WWII heritage of Rackheath some site investigations are likely to be required. A safe pedestrian route to Rackheath Primary School can be achieved so the site is considered to be a reasonable alternative.

Three sites are promoted on the inner side of the Northern Distributor Road (GNLP2092, GNLP0095 and GNLP2166). These sites are not considered to be reasonable alternatives as they are located within land allocated as a landscape buffer to the NDR (GT2), and the AAP policies are not being superseded by the GNLP. These sites are also close to Rackheath Hall and historic gardens with likely

landscape character and heritage impacts. Access to facilities is poor, in particular Rackheath Primary School is located on the other side of the NDR with no safe route available.

A further three sites are promoted to the north of Rackheath Industrial Estate, east and west of Wroxham Road (GNLP1029, GNLP1030 and GNLP1060). The two sites west of Wroxham Road (GNLP1029 and GNLP1030) are less well related to existing facilities and are not able to provide a safe route to school, these are therefore not considered to be reasonable alternatives. Site GNLP1060 is proposed as two separate parcels of land either side of the Wroxham Road. The site is promoted for mixed use development and relocation of Wroxham Football Club. The land to the east of Wroxham Road promoted as mixed use development is part of a larger site already allocated for mixed use development (GT16) which is not part of this consultation. Land to the west of Wroxham Road is proposal for relocation of Wroxham football club and a car park on a 7.4 ha site. Relocating the football club would require substantial investment, likely to be significantly more than would be achieved by the football club from redevelopment of the ground. Given this situation, there is not a reasonable likelihood that the proposed residential development at Wroxham (GNLP0041) would take place and so an allocation for the football club at this location is unlikely to be justified. Site GNLP1060 is therefore not considered to be 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>Rackheath</b>			
Land to the west of Green Lane West, Rackheath	GNLP0172	11.44	Residential (unspecified number)
Heathwood Gospel Hall, Green Lane West	GNLP0351	0.75	Residential (unspecified number)
Land east of Green Lane West	GNLP0478	44.60	Residential development of 142 open market and affordable dwellings with 31.78ha of green infrastructure in the form of a country park and recreation ground
North-east of Green Lane West	GNLP2037	1.04	10 dwellings
<b>Total area of land</b>		<b>57.83 (31.78 GI)</b>	

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

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP0172
<b>Address:</b>	Land to the west of Green Lane West, Rackheath
<b>Proposal:</b>	Residential (unspecified number)

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

**CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA**

**Amber Constraints in HELAA**

Access, Accessibility to Services, Utilities Capacity, Contamination and Ground Stability, Flood Risk, Significant Landscapes, Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses

**HELAA Conclusion**

This is a large site of 11 ha, bisected by the Northern Distributor Road (NDR). The eastern portion of the site would be most likely accessed from Green Lane West, with the western side related to parkland north of Rackheath Hall. Land fronting Green Lane West is likely to have the best development potential. As well as access difficulties and constraints due to the NDR, other issues are landscape impacts on Rackheath Park, surface water flood risk across some parts of the land, possible contamination associated to the former WWII Airfield uses, and utilities capacity. Whilst parts of the site are significantly constrained, the land is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.

**FURTHER COMMENTS**

**Highways**

East, Yes. Subject to satisfactory access, frontage development. West No. No apparent means of access. Is this green-space, how would it be accessed?

**Development Management**

GNLP0172 is a commitment for 205 dwellings (east of NDR) and open space (west of NDR) under 20172208 (Development Management Committee resolution to approve)

**Minerals & Waste**

The site is underlain by a defined Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. Any future development on this site will need to address the requirements of Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 - 'safeguarding' (or any

successor policy) in relation to mineral resources, to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority.

**Lead Local Flood Authority**

Mitigation required for heavy constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. This proposed site is split into 2 areas, one west of the A1270 and one west of Green Lane West. Site west of the A1270: there is a flowpath along the north-western side of the site in a 1% and 0.1% event as shown in the Environment Agency's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. Watercourse not apparent (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). AW foul sewer is located along the western boundary of the site. Located in Source Protection Zone 3. Site west of Green Lane West: There is a flowpath along the centre of the site in a 0.1% event as shown in the Environment Agency's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. Watercourse not apparent (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). AW foul sewers are located in numerous positions within the site and an AW surface water sewer runs through the site diagonally. Located in Source Protection Zone 3.

**PLANNING HISTORY:**

Not known

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

No additional documents submitted to support this proposal.

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP0351
<b>Address:</b>	Heathwood Gospel Hall, Green Lane West
<b>Proposal:</b>	Residential (unspecified number)

<b>CURRENT USE OF SITE:</b>	<b>BROWNFIELD/GREENFIELD:</b>
Place of Worship	Brownfield

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<p><b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b>  Accessibility to Services, Transport and Roads, Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses</p>
<p><b>HELAA Conclusion</b>  This is a 0.6 ha site, currently used as a place of worship, fronting Green Lane West, near to existing development along the road. This is a relatively small site and access into it from Green Lane West is possible, as it is now. Constraints on the site for residential development are relatively few, although to the rear of the site is a series of small industrial units. Some consideration to mitigations to manage the compatibility of neighbouring residential and industrial estate uses might be required. The site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.</p>

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<p><b>Highways</b>  Yes. Footway and frontage development required</p> <p><b>Development Management</b>  Other than tree constraints which may reduce the developable area there are no significant issues with this site. However, whilst within the settlement limit current DM policies relating to the loss of community facilities would be relevant for a planning application which require demonstration that the use is no longer viable or plans for its replacement are included. Assumed that access arrangements would be as existing and would not want to fetter access into GT16.</p> <p><b>Minerals &amp; Waste</b>  The site is underlain by a defined Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. As the site is under 2 hectares it is exempt from the requirements of Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 – ‘safeguarding’, in relation to mineral resources. If the site area is amended in the future to make the area over 2 hectares CS16 (or any successor policy) will apply.</p> <p><b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b>  Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage. RoSFW mapping indicates that the site is not at risk from surface water flooding. There are</p>



no watercourses shown on mapping near the site. Given the location of the site there may be sewerage connections available. If not surface water drainage will be reliant on the results of infiltration testing.

**PLANNING HISTORY:**

No recent history

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

- Site Layout

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLPO478
<b>Address:</b>	Land east of Green Lane West
<b>Proposal:</b>	Residential development of 142 open market and affordable dwellings with 31.78 ha of green infrastructure in the form of a country park and recreation ground

<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, Contamination and Ground Stability, Flood Risk, Significant Landscapes, Transport and Roads, Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses</p>
<p><b>HELAA Conclusion</b>  This is a large site of 39 ha, bisected by the Northern Distributor Road (NDR). Residential development would most likely be accessed off Green Lane West with the remainder of the land forming a new country park. Constraints of the site relate to forming a suitable new junction arrangement, possible contamination associated to the former WWII Airfield uses, utilities capacity, surface water flood risk across some parts, landscape implications for Rackheath Park, and possibly disturbance from the NDR affecting some parts of the site. Whilst some of the site is significantly constrained, there is scope for mitigations and compensatory measures and on that basis the land is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.</p>

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<p><b>Highways</b>  East, Yes (142 dwellings). West No, unless green space only and subject to suitable access, any proposal would need to ensure no parking takes place at A1151.</p>
<p><b>Development Management</b>  Will result in significant landscape impact and highly visible from NDR and Wroxham Road changing the character of the area. Is this scale of development required bearing in mind commitment? What are access arrangements?</p>
<p><b>Minerals &amp; Waste</b>  The site is underlain by a defined Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. Any future development on this site will need to address the requirements of Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 - 'safeguarding' (or any successor policy) in relation to mineral resources, to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority.</p>

**Lead Local Flood Authority**

Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. There is a surface water flowpath for the 0.1% event as shown on the Environment Agency's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) as a result of the ordinary watercourse which traverses a small element of the site to the west and south. Watercourse is apparent.

**PLANNING HISTORY:**

Not known

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

- Proposal Plan
- Green Infrastructure Strategy
- Site Access

<b>Site Reference:</b>	GNLP2037
<b>Address:</b>	North-east of Green Lane West
<b>Proposal:</b>	10 dwellings

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

<b>CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE HELAA</b>
<b>Amber Constraints in HELAA</b> Access, Accessibility to Services, Contamination and Ground Stability
<b>HELAA Conclusion</b> This is a 1.04 ha site promoted for 10 dwellings, currently used for agriculture, fronting Green Lane West. The land is promoted for residential use and is next to existing site allocations GT16 (north Rackheath). Initial evidence from the Highway Authority has suggested the site is suitable, subject to achieving acceptable access improvements onto Green Lane West. The site is mostly greenfield but there are some existing structures that will be demolished and given the WWII heritage of Rackheath some site investigations are likely to be required. No constraints are identified relating to utilities crossing the site, loss of open space, or flood risk that would rule out development. The site is consequently concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.

<b>FURTHER COMMENTS</b>
<b>Highways</b> Yes. Footway and frontage development required (10 dwellings)
<b>Development Management</b> Site is within settlement limit therefore no need to allocate? Also may struggle to achieve 15 dwellings (promoted for 10).
<b>Minerals &amp; Waste</b> The site is underlain by a defined Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. As the site is under 2 hectares it is exempt from the requirements of Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 – ‘safeguarding’, in relation to mineral resources. If the site area is amended in the future to make the area over 2 hectares CS16 (or any successor policy) will apply.
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b> No comments.

<b>PLANNING HISTORY:</b>
--------------------------

No relevant history
---------------------

<b>BRIEF SUMMARY OF PLANS/DOCUMENTS PROVIDED WITH THE SUBMISSION</b>
--

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).**

Four reasonable alternative sites have been identified in Rackheath at stage 5 of this booklet. 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 development. 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 6 above.

The current local plan identifies Rackheath as part of the OSRT Growth Triangle. The OSRT GT AAP as a whole has a commitment of approx. 12,500 dwellings, including approx. 3,200 in Rackheath. NB the GNLP will not supersede the AAP document – the allocations at GT16 – GT19 are therefore not available for comment in the GNLP public consultation. The ‘Towards a Strategy’ document considers this commitment and therefore specifies 200 dwellings as an indicative figure for new allocations in the north east sector. Through further discussion sites GNLP0172 and GNLP0351 were identified as the most suitable sites to allocate for 215 dwellings to meet this number. There is considered to be no reasonable alternative to this approach.

GNLP0478 (site access in question) and GNLP2037 (too small) have been dismissed.

In conclusion there are two sites identified as preferred options in Rackheath providing for 215 new homes. This gives a total deliverable housing commitment for Rackheath of 3,415 homes between 2018 – 2038. NB the previous allocations GT16 – GT19 are carried forward allocations but the AAP sites are not available for comment.

**Preferred Sites:**

Address	Site Reference	Area (Ha)	Proposal	Reason for allocating
<b>Rackheath</b>				
Land to the west of Green Lane West	GNLP0172	11.44	200 dwellings	This site is promoted as two parcels of land bisected by the Broadland Northway (A1270). It is considered appropriate for allocation as at the date of writing there is an existing committee resolution to approve an application for 205 dwellings on the site (reference 20172208). Residential development should be limited to land to the east of the A1270. Land to the west is only

Address	Site Reference	Area (Ha)	Proposal	Reason for allocating
				suitable for open space as it is within the landscape buffer for the Broadland Northway and close to the historic gardens of Rackheath Hall, a grade II listed building.
Heathwood Gospel Hall, Green lane West	GNLP0351	0.75	15 dwellings	This is a brownfield site within the existing settlement limit where development is acceptable in principle. Constraints on the site for residential development are relatively few, although some mitigation may be necessary due to the location of industrial buildings to the rear. Subject to footpath connections, and development

#### Reasonable Alternative Sites:

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason for not allocating
<b>Rackheath</b>				
NO REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE SITES				

#### Unreasonable Sites:

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason considered to be unreasonable
<b>Rackheath</b>				
Land to the east of Salhouse Road	GNLP0095	5.27	Up to 8 dwellings off a private drive	This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as it is located within land designated as a landscape buffer to the Broadland Northway and is close to Rackheath Hall and its historic gardens with likely landscape character and heritage impacts. Access to facilities is poor, Rackheath Primary school is located on the other side of the Broadland Northway with no safe walking route available.

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason considered to be unreasonable
Land east of Green Lane West	GNLP0478	44.60	Residential development of 142 open market and affordable dwellings with 31.78ha of green infrastructure in the form of a Country Park and recreation ground	There is potential to consider this site in combination with other sites put forward for development along Green Lane West which is paved and could provide a safe pedestrian route to the school. However, the site is currently an unreasonable alternative, unless the landowner can demonstrate an acceptable access strategy.
North east of Green Lane West	GNLP2037	1.04	10 dwellings	This site is within the existing settlement limit where development is acceptable in principle provided that it does not result in any significant adverse impact. The site is not considered suitable for allocation as it is unlikely to be able to accommodate the minimum level of allocation and would be better to come forward through the planning application process.
South of Salhouse Road	GNLP2092	20.84	Residential (unspecified number)	This site is considered to be unsuitable for allocation as it is located within land allocated as a landscape buffer to the Broadland Northway and close to Rackheath Hall and its historic gardens with likely landscape character and heritage impacts. Access to facilities is poor, Rackheath Primary school is located on the other side of the Broadland Northway with no safe walking route available.
South of Warren Road	GNLP2166	12.94	216 dwellings plus GI	This site is considered to be unsuitable for allocation as it is located within land allocated as a landscape buffer to the Broadland Northway and close to Rackheath Hall and its



Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason considered to be unreasonable
				historic gardens with likely landscape character and heritage impacts. Access to facilities is poor, Rackheath Primary school is located on the other side of the Broadland Northway with no safe walking route available.
Land east of Back Lane	GNLP1029	0.81	Approx. 20 self build plots	This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation. The main constraints are over the road junction with Back Lane and the A1151. In addition, the site is 3 km from the primary school with no safe pedestrian route.
Land south of Dobb's Lane	GNLP1030	2.81	84 dwellings	This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation. The main constraints are over the road junction with Back Lane and the A1151. In addition, the site is 3 km from the primary school with no safe pedestrian route.
Land to the south of Swash Lane and Muck Lane	GNLP1060	24.73	Relocation of Wroxham Football club with mixed use development of residential and commercial	This site is promoted for mixed use development and relocation of Wroxham Football Club. Relocating the football club would require significant investment, likely to be significantly more than would be achieved from redevelopment of the ground. Given this situation there is not a reasonable likelihood that the proposed residential development at Wroxham (GNLP0041) would take place and so an allocation for the football club at this location is unlikely to be justified at the current time.

