STAGE 1 – LIST OF SITES PROMOTED IN THE SETTLEMENT

LIST OF SITES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RESIDENTIAL ALLOCATION (0.5 HECTARES OR LARGER)

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Proposal
None			
Total area of land		0.00	

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

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Proposal	
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				
Caistor St Edmund & Bixley							
Park Farm, Bungay Road	GNLP0323	9.83	Employment and Commercial				
Land at Loddon Road and Bungay Road	GNLP3051	7.91	Park & Ride				
Trowse with Newton							
Land at and adjacent to Whitlingham Country Park	GNLP3052	200	Recreation and tourism associated with the existing Country Park				

(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

None

STAGE 3 – SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION COMMENTS

Site Reference	Comments
None	

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

No residential sites submitted

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.

No residential sites submitted

STAGE 6 – DETAILED SITE ASSESSMENTS OF REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE SITES

None

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

There are no sites identified as preferred options in Trowse as no residential sites were submitted. There is one carried forward allocation providing for 173 new homes and a total of 71 additional dwellings with planning permission. This gives a total deliverable housing commitment for Trowse of 244 homes between 2018 – 2038.

Also see the non-residential booklet for sites at Whitlingham and Bixley.

Preferred Sites:

Address	Site Reference	Area (Ha)	Proposal	Reason for allocating		
Trowse						
NO PREFERRED) SITES					

Reasonable Alternative Sites:

Address	Site Reference		Promoted for	Reason for not allocating
Trowse				
NO REASONABLE	ALTERNATI	VE SITE	S	

Unreasonable Sites:

Address	Site Reference	Area (ha)	Promoted for	Reason considered to be unreasonable
Trowse	-			
NO UNREASO	NABLE SITES			

