



localplan.snc@southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk
South Norfolk Place Shaping Team

Our ref:
PL00751046

Telephone 01223 582775

31 January 2024

Dear Mr Harris

South Norfolk Village Clusters Local Plan Regulation Consultation on Alternative Sites and Focused Changes

Thank you for consulting Historic England on the South Norfolk Village Clusters Alternative Sites and Focused Changes. As a statutory consultee, our role is to ensure that the conservation of the historic environment is fully integrated into planning policy and that any policy documents make provision for a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.

Your consultation asks a number of questions which we address below.

SN0433, Land south of Wheel Road, Alington

QUESTION 2a

Do you agree with the allocation of SN0433, Land south of Wheel Road, Alington for at least 12 dwellings on an area of 1.0ha? Please explain your response.

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there is a grade II listed building, Stacey's Cottage to the south of the site. The development has the potential to impact the significance of this heritage asset via a change in its setting.

We welcome the preparation of the Heritage Impact Assessment for the site. The assessment recommends a landscaping buffer along the southern boundary of the site to help mitigate any impact on the listed building to the south as well as retention of hedgerow along eastern border, limiting density to retain rural character and open space long eastern boundary to separate development from Wheel of Fortune PH.





QUESTION 2b

If the site is allocated, do you think there are any specific requirements that should be set out in the allocation policy?

The HIA has identified the need for landscape buffer along the southern boundary of the site as well as retention of hedgerow along eastern border, limiting density to retain rural character and open space long eastern boundary to separate development from Wheel of Fortune PH. These requirements should be included as a criterion in the policy for the site.

SN6000, Land north of Chapel Street, Barford

QUESTION 3a

Do you agree with the allocation of SN6000, Land north of Chapel Street, Barford? Please explain your response.

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there is a grade II listed building, School Farmhouse, to the south east of the site. The development has the potential to impact the significance of this heritage asset via a change in its setting.

We welcome the preparation of the Heritage Impact Assessment for the site. However, the HIA doesn't really explore the relationship between the farmhouse and the former farmland.

The HIA says that there will be no harm to the significance of the heritage asset. However, we consider this underplays the relationship between the farmhouse, the barns to the rear and the former agricultural land beyond.

We consider that some open space/landscaping to help protect the setting of the farmhouse would be helpful.

We suggest that the HIA is revisited to address this.

We note that part of the site is to be used as a recreation ground. Careful rearrangement of the layout of land uses could be used to both deliver housing, open space and protection for the setting of the heritage asset.

We look forward to seeing a revised HIA and hope that this will address our concerns.

QUESTION 3b

If the site is allocated, do you think there are any specific requirements that should be set out in the allocation policy?

The policy wording should include provision of open space/landscaping in the south eastern corner of the site to provide an appropriate setting for the farmhouse and





maintain some connection to the former agricultural land. There should also be a requirement for archaeological desk-based assessment to inform any planning application and investigation prior to commencement of development.

SN0552REVC, Land north of Watton Road, Barford

QUESTION 4a

Do you agree with the allocation of SN0552REVC, Land north of Watton Road, Barford, as an extension to VC BAR1, for up to 20 additional dwellings on an area of 0.73ha? Please explain your response.

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there is a grade II listed building, Sayers Farmhouse, to the south of the site, just across Watton Road. The development has the potential to impact the significance of this heritage asset via a change in its setting.

We welcome the preparation of the Heritage Impact Assessment for the site. However, the HIA identifies a major impact on the significance of the heritage asset. There would be considerable harm to the significance of the asset through development within its setting. Whilst we note suggested mitigation in the form of planting and open space, this is not sufficient.

Therefore, we would recommend that this site should **not be allocated**.

QUESTION 4b

If the site is allocated, do you think there are any specific requirements that should be set out in the allocation policy?

We recommend that the site is not allocated but if the site is allocated, we would expect the policy criterion to include the mitigation measures recommended in the HIA including planting and open space and views to the countryside.

SN0055, Land east of Spur Road and south of Norwich Road, Barnham Broom

QUESTION 5a

Do you agree with the allocation of SN0055, Land east of Spur Road and south of Norwich Road, Barnham Broom, for approximately 15 dwellings on an area of 1.0ha? Please explain your response.

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, Home Farm lies to the east of the site. The development has the potential to impact the significance of this heritage asset via a change in its setting.

We welcome the preparation of the Heritage Impact Assessment for the site. We welcome the identification of Grove Farm as a non-designated heritage asset. The HIA also highlights the fact that the whole site is part of a World War II military site





recorded on the HER. Further assessment of the archaeological significance is needed now to determine the suitability or otherwise of this site. We would like to see the further assessment before drawing any further conclusions in relation to the suitability of the site.

QUESTION 5b

If the site is allocated, do you think there are any specific requirements that should be set out in the allocation policy?

Depending upon the outcomes of the archaeological assessment, if the site is considered suitable for allocation, the policy criteria should include the recommendations from the HIA including tree planting along the southern boundary, low density developer to retain rural character, area of open space along eastern boundary to maintain separation between development and Grove Farm, retention of sight line from Grove Farm to Norwich Road and archaeological investigation prior to commencement of development.

VC BAW1 REV, Land to the east of Stocks Hill, Bawburgh

QUESTION 6

Do you agree with the boundary of revised allocation VC BAW1 REV, Land to the east of Stocks Hill, Bawburgh, to facilitate a reduced density of up to 35 dwellings on an area of 1.9ha? Please explain your response.

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within this site, the site lies immediately to the south of the boundary of the Bawburgh Conservation Area. Any development of this site therefore has the potential to affect the Conservation area and its setting including views into and out of the Conservation area.

We note that the revised allocation boundary has been extended to enable a lower density of development. We broadly welcome this approach.

We reiterate our previous comments in relation to archaeological investigation for this site.

Bullet point 3 states that the HER should be consulted to determine the need for any archaeological surveys prior to development. However, this is different to the recommendation in the HIA which states that 'Require investigation on the proposed site prior to development commencing to identify and further historic activity'.

In our view, some assessment is needed to inform any planning application.

We therefore advise that bullet point 3 should be amended to read, 'Planning applications should be supported by archaeological assessment including the results of field evaluation where appropriate.'





VC DIT1 REV, Land at Thwaite Road and Tunney's Lane, Ditchingham

QUESTION 7a

Do you agree with the proposed allocation of VC DIT1 REV, Land at Thwaite Road and Tunney's Lane, Ditchingham, for up to 45 dwellings on an area of on an area of 2.42ha? Please explain your response.

No comments

QUESTION 7b

Do you think there are any specific requirements that should be added to the allocation policy to accommodate the extra 10 dwellings?

We welcome the preparation of the HIA. The recommendations of the HIA in relation to archaeology should be included in the policy requirements.

SN4020, Land west of Old Yarmouth Road, Broome

QUESTION 8a

Do you agree with the proposed allocation of SN4020, Land west of Old Yarmouth Road, Broome for at least 12 dwellings on an area of 0.76ha? Please explain your response.

No comments

QUESTION 8b

If the site is allocated, do you think there are any specific requirements that should be set out in the allocation policy?

We welcome the preparation of the HIA. The recommendations of the HIA in relation to archaeology should be included in the policy requirements.

SN0218REV, Land north of The Street, Earsham

QUESTION 9a

Do you agree with the allocation of SN0218REV, Land north of The Street, Earsham for up to 25 dwellings on an area of 1.4ha? Please explain your response.

No comments

QUESTION 9b

If the site is allocated, do you think there are any specific requirements that should be set out in the allocation policy?

We welcome the preparation of the HIA. The recommendations of the HIA in relation to archaeology should be included in the policy requirements.





VC GIL1 REV, South of Geldeston Road and Daisy Way, Gillingham

QUESTION 10a

Do you agree with the proposed allocation VC GIL1 REV, South of Geldeston Road and Daisy Way, Gillingham, on 2.92ha, for approximately 40 dwellings. Please explain your response.

No comments

QUESTION 10b

Do you think there are any specific requirements that should be added to the allocation policy to accommodate the extra 5 dwellings?

No comments

VC SWA2, Land on Main Road, Swardeston

QUESTION 11a

Do you agree with the proposed increase in density on allocation VC SWA2, Land on Main Road, Swardeston, to accommodate approximately 40 dwellings? Please explain your response.

No comments

QUESTION 11b

Do you think there are any specific requirements that should be added to the allocation policy to accommodate the extra 10 dwellings?

We reiterate our previous comments in relation to archaeological investigation for this site.

Bullet point 3 states that the HER should be consulted to determine the need for any archaeological surveys prior to development.

In our view, some assessment is needed to inform any planning application.

We therefore advise that bullet point 3 should be amended to read, 'Planning applications should be supported by archaeological assessment including the results of field evaluation where appropriate.'

VC SPO1 REV, Land west of Bunwell Road, Spooner Row

QUESTION 12a

Do you agree with the proposed allocation VC SPO1 REV, Land west of Bunwell Road, Spooner Row, for approximately 35 dwellings on 2.34ha? Please explain your response.





We re-iterate our previous response in relation to the smaller site. Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies immediately to the north east of the grade II listed property, The Orchards. Therefore, any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the significance of this heritage asset. We appreciate that the property is well screened by existing landscaping.

We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome paragraph 34.8 and the second bullet point of the policy in relation to strengthening boundary vegetation.

QUESTION 12b

Do you think there are any specific requirements that should be added to the allocation policy to accommodate the extra 20 dwellings?

As advised in our previous response, Bullet point 5 states that the HER should be consulted to determine the need for any archaeological surveys prior to development.

In our view, some assessment is needed to inform any planning application.

We therefore advise that bullet point 5 should be amended to read, 'Planning applications should be supported by archaeological assessment including the results of field evaluation where appropriate.'

VC TAC1 REV, Land to the west of Norwich Road, Tacolneston

QUESTION 13a

Do you agree with the boundary of revised allocation VC TAC1 REV, Land to the west of Norwich Road, Tacolneston, to facilitate 'approximately 25 dwellings' on 1.0ha? Please explain your response.

No comments

QUESTION 13b

Do you think there are any specific requirements that should be added to the allocation policy to reflect these changes?

No comments

VC WIC1 REV, Land to the south of Wicklewood Primary School

QUESTION 14a

Do you agree with the proposed allocation VC WIC1 REV, Land to the south of Wicklewood Primary School, to accommodate up to 40 dwellings on 2.97ha? Please explain your response.

No comments

QUESTION 14b





Do you think there are any specific requirements that should be added to the allocation policy to accommodate the extra 10 dwellings?

No comments

SUMMARY

We very much welcome the completion of the Heritage Impact Assessments for a number of sites. The assessments should inform the policy criteria for the sites.

We have particular concerns about the SN055 RevC Barford site and recommend that this site is not allocated.

We have suggested you revisit the HIA for SN6000 Barford site to address setting issues for the Farmhouse.

We also suggest that you undertake further assessment of archaeological significance for the Barnham Broome site.

We look forward to seeing these assessments to help confirm whether the sites are suitable for allocation.

Finally, in preparation of the local plan, we encourage you to draw on the knowledge of local conservation officers, the county archaeologist and local heritage groups.

Please note that absence of a comment on a policy, allocation or document in this letter does not mean that Historic England is content that the policy, allocation or document is devoid of historic environment issues.

We should like to stress that this response is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise as a result of this plan, where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

If you have any questions then please do get back to me.

Debbie Mack
Historic Environment Planning Adviser
Debbie.Mack@HistoricEngland.org.uk

