

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

Summary Table: Small Growth Village Review

Settlement in Policy SD3	Services Criteria met Y/N	Significant Environmental Constraints Y/N	Can a settlement boundary be drawn Y/N	Small Growth Village (SGV)/ Constrained SGV/ Countryside
Aldborough	Y	N	Y	SGV
Bacton	Y	N	Y	SGV
Badersfield	Y	N	Y	SGV
Binham	Y	N	Y	SGV
Catfield	Y	N	Y	SGV
Corpusty & Saxthorpe	Y	N	Y	SGV
East Runton	Y	N	Y	SGV
Happisburgh	Y	N	Y	SGV
High Kelling	Y	N	Y	SGV
Horning	Y	N	Y	SGV
Langham	N	N	N/A	Countryside
Little Snoring	Y	N	Y	SGV
Little Walsingham	Y	N	Y	SGV
Overstrand	Y	N	Y	SGV
Potter Heigham	Y	Y	N	Constrained SGV
Roughton	Y	N	Y	SGV
Sculthorpe	Y	N	Y	SGV
Sea Palling	Y	Y	N	Constrained SGV
Sutton	Y	N	Y	SGV
Southrepps	Y	N	Y	SGV
Trunch	Y	N	Y	SGV
Walcott	Y	Y	N	Constrained SGV
West Runton	Y	N	Y	SGV
Weybourne	Y	N	Y	SGV

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

Aldborough:
Summary Regulation 18 Comments: none specific to being potentially allocated as a small growth village.
Services/facilities review: no changes. Constraints: Any proposed development would need to take account of the environmental and infrastructure constraints set out in Background Paper 2, but these constraints would not limit the principle of development within the settlement. Land supply: As part of the Call for Sites, 24 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 5 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.
Conclusion: Aldborough continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a SGV.

Bacton:
Summary Regulation 18 Comments: Individual's: (LP207, LP603) Objection to Bacton being identified as a SGV due to impact development could have on the character of the village, which historically has a 'scattered or 'dispersed' settlement pattern. Express concerns about the adequacy of infrastructure, public transport and traffic and associated pollution. Difficulty getting to doctors, schools and shops. Parking and a bypass of the old part of the village is needed before development is built. Issue with the number of second homes and impact on housing affordability. PC & TC's: Bacton & Edingthorpe PC (LP239) object to Bacton being identified as a SGV, instead wishing to allow the local community to exercise greater control of future housing growth by relying on the provisions within Policy HOU3 and exception sites delivery. The Parish Council comment that the village does not have enough facilities conducive for further expansion, as two public houses (The Ship and Duke of Edinburgh) have been lost since the previous local plan. The retail offer is very limited and generally geared towards holidaymakers – a small scale village store, fish & chip shop and cafes. In addition, the Post Office has extremely limited hours (only open 30 mins a week), there is no doctor's/ medical service within the parish and a limited bus service.
Services/facilities review: The Parish Councils objection in principle and comments are noted with regard to the services/ facilities/ public transport. However, the amount and range of existing services has not altered since the assessment within Background Paper 2. Therefore, no changes are proposed. Constraints: As set out in Background Paper 2, the village of Bacton is constrained by tidal flooding to the southeast and surface water flooding predominantly along the roads through the village. Bacton's coastline falls within the Coastal Erosion Constraint Area (CECA), which encroaches the built form to the northwest and southeast of the village. Also the northern area falls within the 50 year coastal erosion zone. Land supply: As part of the Call for Sites & HELAA, 8 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 3 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18. It is noted that the northern part of BACT09 falls within the 100 year coastal erosion zone.
Conclusion: Whilst the Parish Council's comments are noted with regards to services and facilities, the amount and range has not altered since the assessment within Background Paper 2. As such, it is concluded that Bacton continues to meet the criteria to be a SGV.

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

Badersfield:
Summary Regulation 18 Comments: Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP803) Hopkins Homes comment that the village lacks market attractiveness due to the presence of the prison and that half of the village falls within Broadland District Council, which further restricts the ability of the Council to secure growth. (LP736) Glavenhill Ltd. comments that whilst Badersfield is considered to lack the necessary services to be 'designated' a larger village within the Settlement Hierarchy, it is capable and in need, due to the presence of a successful Enterprise Park that lacks a large residential / working population nearby, and the need to provide additional new affordable homes, of accommodating additional residential and local service provision beyond that facilitated through draft Policy SD3.
Services/facilities review: no changes required. Constraints: There is pockets of known surface water flooding, mainly along roads within the village. Land supply: As part of the Call for Sites, 1 site has been recorded as an alternative site for housing development and 2 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.
Conclusion: Badersfield continues to meet the criteria to be a SGV.

Binham:
Summary Regulation 18 Comments: Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP803) Hopkins Homes comments that the village of Binham (along with 7 other identified SGV's) is capable of sustaining in excess of 27 additional dwellings.
Services/facilities review: no changes to assessment. Constraints: Any proposed development would need to take account of the known environmental and infrastructure constraints set out in Background Paper 2, but these constraints would not limit the principle of development within the settlement. Land supply: As part of the Call for Sites & HELAA, 1 site has been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 2 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.
Conclusion: Binham continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a SGV.

Catfield:
Summary Regulation 18 Comments: none.
Services/facilities review: no changes. Constraints: The village is constrained to the north and east by areas of land that fall within flood zones 2 and 3. There are further flood risk constraints to the west. Land supply: As part of the Call for Sites & HELAA, 11 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development, 2 of these for mixed use.
Conclusion: Catfield continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a SGV.

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

Corpusty & Saxthorpe:
Summary Regulation 18 Comments: Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP803) Hopkins Homes comments that the village of Corpusty (along with other identified SGV's) is capable of sustaining in excess of 27 additional dwellings.
Services/facilities review: no changes to assessment. Constraints: no changes identified. Land supply: As part of the Call for Sites and regulation 18 no sites have been put forward. However, Corpusty & Saxthorpe have an adopted Neighbourhood Plan (NP), dated 1 st April 2019, which allocates two Priority Development Areas (PDA) for housing and one PDA for mixed residential and business use.
Conclusion: Corpusty & Saxthorpe continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a SGV. Although no sites have been put forward as part of Regulation 18, within the Corpusty & Saxthorpe NP, which combined will adequately accommodate future growth.

East Runton:
Summary Regulation 18 Comments: none specific to being potentially allocated as a small growth village.
Services/facilities review: no changes. Constraints: no changes to those listed within Background Paper 2. Land supply: 8 housing sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.
Conclusion: East Runton continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a small growth village for modest, small scale growth in order to help address housing need.

Happisburgh:
Summary Regulation 18 Comments: Individual's: (LP603) objects to Happisburgh as a SGV due to issues with second homes, affordability, impact on infrastructure, public transport and traffic.
Services/facilities review: no changes. Constraints: No changes to those listed within with Background Paper 2. Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites & HELAA, 12 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 1 additional site has been submitted under Regulation 18.
Conclusion: Happisburgh continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a SGV.

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

High Kelling:

Summary Regulation 18 Comments:

Parish & Town Councils: (LP147) High Kelling PC objects stating concern that creeping development in such a location would threaten the quality of the landscape. It recognises that some development is necessary but feels such development should enhance the character of the village and its setting within the countryside and the AONB and considers that there is potential for development in those parts of the village outside the AONB. High Kelling shares medical and dental provision with Holt, which means additional pressure on services already overstretched with the volume of users.

Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP291, LP293) White Lodge Ltd. supports identification of High Kelling as a SGV as it has a good range of services including post office, shop, village hall and church. Holt hospital to the west of village includes a medical practice, pharmacy and dental practice. Easy walking distance from site to these services. Well placed to support Kelling Primary School, 2.6 miles away accessible by bus. Holt is 2.5km away, accessible on foot. Locating development in High Kelling, would, therefore, enhance and maintain existing services in the village and other surrounding villages.

(LP746, LP749) Kelling Estate LLP also supports identification of High Kelling as a SGV, as it is served by a primary school, convenience shop and GP surgery, as key services. It states that the village offers infill plots, which could be released for housing development that would make a positive contribution to meeting future housing needs, while preserving the special character and appearance of the conservation area.

Services/facilities review: no changes. The settlement in its own right would not meet the requirements of the methodology, but due to its proximity to Holt, it means that the village does comply

Constraints: It is noted that the part of the settlement to the north of the Cromer Road (A148) falls within the North Norfolk AONB and the southern part does not, where the principle of development would be more favoured by the Parish Council.

Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites, 2 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 3 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.

Conclusion: High Kelling continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a SGV.

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

Horning:

Summary Regulation 18 Comments:

Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP746, LP749) Kelling Estate LLP notes that in the adopted Site Allocations DPD (2011) it was considered appropriate to allocate sites for more than 20 dwellings at a number of 'Small Growth Villages', one being in Horning (a site for 26 dwellings). This site is subject of a current planning application (reference 11/1505) that has remained undetermined for approaching 8 years. The delay is due to significant constraints at Horning in relation to lack of capacity in the local water treatment system and the heightened sensitivity of the nearby water environment due to the immediate proximity of the village to the Norfolk Broads. The most recent joint position statement signed by the Council, the Environment Agency (EA), the Broads Authority (BA) and Anglian Water (AW) suggests that this position is under constant review.

Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP477, LP478) EA comments that the Councils should be aware of constraints at Horning Water Recycling Centre (WRC's) (amongst others) as it is either over or very near to current permitted capacities. Development within this area needs to be planned with caution and early consultation with the sewerage company will be vital. No development should commence until clear plans are agreed for the necessary sewerage infrastructure improvements.

Services/facilities review: no changes.

Constraints: These remain as set out in Background Paper 2. In addition, the EA and AW comments regarding the Horning WRC indicate that there is likely to be an embargo on development throughout the plan period.

Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites & HELAA, 6 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 10 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.

Conclusion: Although the constraints listed will affect the deliverability of development within the plan period, this does not change the status of inclusion of Horning, as a SGV.

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

Langham:
Summary Regulation 18 Comments: Individual's: (LP778) Langham is listed as having a community shop and post office (within the community shop). There is no shop or post office. Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP803) Hopkins Homes supports that the village of Langham (along with other identified SGV's) is capable of sustaining a development in excess of 27 additional dwellings. (LP234) Fleur developments Ltd. also supports Langham in the same manner.
Services/facilities review: Following up on comment LP778, omitting a community shop (as a key service) and post office (as a secondary service) means that Langham (with 1 key service (Langham Village School), 2 secondary services (Public House and Village Hall) and 1 desirable service (Place of Worship - St. Andrew and St. Mary's Church)) falls below the required level of services as set out in Background Paper 2: Distribution Growth. Constraints: as recorded within Background paper 2. Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites, 1 site has been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 1 additional site has been submitted under Regulation 18.
Conclusion: Langham does not meet the threshold of services required under the methodology set out in Background Paper 2 and as such, it should be removed from the list of Small Growth Villages.

Little Snoring:
Summary Regulation 18 Comments: Individual's: (LP144) Objects to Little Snoring being a SGV, but should be regarded as being capable of small infill development, as it does not currently have the necessary services (eg. small shop attached to caravan site, infrequent bus service, no village hall, limited capacity at school). (LP786) objects on the basis that any further development is likely to be in to open countryside, which would have an adverse impact on the landscape/ wildlife and the lack of services (as already stated). Also, limited public transport, issues with road network, broadband nearing capacity, Limited capacity at WasteWater treatment works. Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP803) Hopkins Homes supports that the village of Little Snoring (along with other identified SGV's) is capable of sustaining a development in excess of 27 additional dwellings. (LP829) Westmere Homes also supports Langham in the same manner.
Services/facilities review: no changes. Constraints: as recorded within Background Paper 2. Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites & HELAA, 13 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 2 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.
Conclusion: Little Snoring continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a SGV.

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

Little Walsingham:

Summary Regulation 18 Comments:

Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP830) Walsingham Estate Management have noticed various inaccuracies with regard to Little Walsingham. Secondary services include the Bull Inn and the Black Lion Hotel. Meeting places include Village hall and parish hall. Desirable services include three vehicle repair shops (centre of village and two on the Industrial estate), three Churches, Russian Orthodox, Methodist and Anglican. Egmore employment site lies within the parish boundary.

Services/facilities review: The Walsingham Estate Management (LP830) comments are acknowledged with regard to other services and facilities. It is noted that Great Walsingham has a Parish Hall and that there are approximately eight places of worship. Combined, the services and facilities meets the criteria as set out in the methodology of Background paper 2.

Constraints: as recorded within Background Paper 2.

Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites & HELAA, 7 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 2 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.

Conclusion: Little Walsingham continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a SGV.

Overstrand:

Summary Regulation 18 Comments:

Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP746, LP749) Kelling Estate LLP supports policy SD3 but considers that whilst some villages may yield a very limited number of dwellings over the plan period others by reasons of their size, location or level of service provision may be capable of supporting a greater level of growth. This change would be consistent with the example set by the adopted Site Allocations DPD where it was considered appropriate to allocate sites for more than 20 dwellings at a number of 'Small Growth Villages'; Overstrand (35 dwellings). Accordingly the footnote to the policy should be amended to read: Infill development and new allocations (to be selected in a Part 2 Plan).

Services/facilities review: no changes.

Constraints: as recorded within Background Paper 2.

Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites & HELAA, 10 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 2 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.

Conclusion: Overstrand continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a SGV.

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

Potter Heigham:

Summary Regulation 18 Comments:

Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP803) Hopkins Homes comments that Potter Heigham contains a range of shops and services but lies almost entirely within the Environment Agency's Flood Zone 3, presenting an overriding constraint to development. Whilst the northern portion partially lies outside of FZs 2 and 3, it is largely severed from the core of the village by the A149. They note that a recent pre-application enquiry (reference IB/18/0340) sought to deliver a potential affordable housing exception site of 10 dwellings on one of the few parcels of land lying outside the Flood Zone. Officers concluded that other constraints existed in relation to the site, including deficient access, landscape impact and distance from services.

Services/facilities review: no changes.

Constraints: as recorded within Background Paper 2. The majority of the village is situated within Flood Zones 2 and 3A with only the northern extent of the settlement located within Flood Zone 1.

Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites, 3 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 4 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.

Conclusion: Potter Heigham continues to meet the requirements to be identified as a SGV, but environmental constraints restrict the likely deliverability of development and so its growth should not be relied upon to meet strategic needs.

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

Roughton:

Summary Regulation 18 Comments:

Individual's: (LP254) Comments that sustainable expansion of the SGVs that have a number of services and act as limited service hubs for other nearby villages thereby comply with the provisions of paragraph 78 of the NPPF.

PC & TC's: (LP240) Roughton PC objects and concludes that Roughton should not be designated as a SGV as the status is unnecessary and puts a burden on existing infrastructure. This would allow the local community instead to exercise greater control in future housing growth over the plan period relying instead on the proposed provisions of Policy HOU03. The reasons for this is that Roughton Parish has previously accepted housing growth but now wish to control the quantity of housing within the village. Roughton has poor public transport links and the general level of service provision in the village is not conducive for its further expansion. We have minimal retail offering which is extremely small-scale. There are no doctors or any other medical facility within the Parish. ROU03 has still not been built on due to lack of interest from developers and this was allocated at the previous consultation circa 10 years ago.

Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP746, LP749) Kelling Estate LLP supports policy SD3 but reference to footnote 11 imposes a limit on development size at Small Growth Villages to up to 20 dwellings. They consider this arbitrary cap is unhelpful and unnecessary and could limit opportunities where larger schemes may be appropriate. The identified Small Growth Villages differ quite significantly in their size and range of service provision. Therefore while some villages may yield a very limited number of dwellings over the plan period others by reasons of their size, location or level of service provision may be capable of supporting a greater level of growth. This change would be consistent with the example set by the adopted Site Allocations DPD where it was considered appropriate to allocate sites for more than 20 dwellings at a number of 'Small Growth Villages'; Roughton (30 dwellings). Accordingly the footnote to the policy should be amended to read: Infill development and new allocations (to be selected in a Part 2 Plan).

Services/facilities review: no changes.

Constraints: as recorded within Background Paper 2. It is noted that the northern part of the village falls within the North Norfolk AONB, where four of the alternative sites are located.

Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites, 11 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 6 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.

Conclusion: Roughton continues to meet the criteria to be a SGV.

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

Sculthorpe:
Summary Regulation 18 Comments: Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP803) Hopkins Homes comments that Sculthorpe is a very small village of a predominantly linear nature with few clear infill opportunities. It also has a predominantly rural character that would be significantly impacted on by any development of scale. This is clear from the refusal of an application for 71 new dwellings at the heart of the village in 2015 (on land which comprises the only site currently promoted towards the HELAA), a scheme dismissed for exactly this reason. Recommends amendments to Policy SD3 to ensure that it forms the basis of a sound strategy: the deletion of Sculthorpe. (LP632, LP633) WSP Indigo, comments that the Council's assessment of Sculthorpe does not accurately represent its potential. The assessment of Sculthorpe in the Distribution of Growth Background Paper overlooks some services that Sculthorpe can offer both in the settlement and the wider area. Importantly, Sculthorpe's proximity to Fakenham is a key factor that has not been taken into account. The Council seems to have considered the proximity of nearby services in other areas. The assessment notes that the limited constraints identified would not limit the principle of development within the settlement. This is inconsistent with its categorisation as a SGV. The lack of constraints affecting the settlement, such as flooding or environmental designations, is a key factor that is not recognised in the emerging Local Plan strategy. The settlement hierarchy categorisation of Sculthorpe means that it is not favoured in the consideration of sites for allocation. Site H0216 risks being overlooked by the Council as Sculthorpe is classed as a Small Growth Village where only small sites will be assessed for allocation, despite its positive assessment in the HELAA. This removes the chance to consider the best sites for development that are in sustainable locations but disregarded by the Council's current methodology. The Distribution of Growth Background Paper identifies that the school is lacking capacity but the site is large enough to accommodate a new school as part of development proposals. The existing School could be further enhanced by the provision of new premises and a playing field. Early Delivery as well as its suitability and availability, as established in the Council's own evidence base, means the site is also deliverable in the short term.
Services/facilities review: The above comments are noted, but they do not alter the assessment of Sculthorpe as set out in Background Paper 2, based on the methodology contained therein. Constraints: as recorded within Background Paper 2. Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites, 1 site has been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 5 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.
Conclusion: Sculthorpe continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a SGV.

Sea Palling:
Summary Regulation 18 Comments: none specific to the potential allocation as a Small Growth Village.
Services/facilities review: no changes. Constraints: as recorded within Background Paper 2. The village is entirely within Flood Zone 3A. Land supply: No sites have been put forward through Call for sites/ HELAA.
Conclusion: Whilst Sea Palling does meet the service requirements to be identified as a SGV, there is significant environmental constraints that would restrict the deliverability of development and so its growth should not be relied upon to meet strategic needs.

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

Southrepps:

Summary Regulation 18 Comments:

Individuals: (LP094, LP206, LP220, LP222, LP242, LP271, LP307, LP409, LP 428) Summary of objections state that any further development in Southrepps will eventually lead to overdevelopment, the loss of individual identity of the village within AONB, impact on wildlife, lack of public transport and put significant strain on the road network. Use empty homes and buildings first. The HELAA and Background Paper 2 describes the village as having no infrastructure constraints, but comments state that the narrow roads makes the village unsuitable for growth other than small sites of 5 or less and that the majority of sites identified within the HELAA do not have access onto roads suitable to take development. Remove Southrepps as a SGV designation. Comments conclude that remaining as a countryside village gives greater control to the local community in 'exceptions'/ affordable housing, whilst retaining its identity.

(LP269) Comments that growth shouldn't be taken in isolation as development in Mundesley will have a direct traffic impact on Southrepps and other villages.

PC & TC's: (LP225) Southrepps PC objects and states that along with the community of Southrepps, it is not opposed to development, but that this should be proportionate and not out of scale with the village in terms of its physical/social/environmental infrastructure, as some recent developments. The PC concludes that the village should NOT be included as a SGV in the emerging Local Plan and states that there would be no objection to the village retaining a settlement boundary, provided that any related policy in the new Local Plan makes it clear that any new development must be within it and very limited to small-scale – one or two plots. As such the preference is for the village to carry a 'Countryside' designation.

Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP803) Hopkins Homes comments it is recognised that Southrepps contains a range of shops, services and amenities sufficient to sustain a level of growth over the plan period. It is, however, entirely washed over by the AONB. Due to the likely availability of alternative sites across the network of villages lying outside of the AONB it is unlikely that exceptional circumstances (as required in NPPF) could be identified, particularly as the village already comprises two allocations capable of accommodating 22 dwellings that are as yet undelivered.

Services/facilities review: Although the comments refer to some of the facilities/ services being outside the village, they remain within the required distance as set out in Background Paper 2 methodology. As such, no changes are recorded.

Constraints: no changes.

Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites, 8 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 1 additional site has been submitted under Regulation 18.

Conclusion: Southrepps continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a SGV.

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

Sutton:

Summary Regulation 18 Comments:

Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP805) Firs Farm Partnership supports identification of Sutton as a SGV. Sutton has a good range of local facilities/ bus services. It is stated that Sutton is located within 1.8 miles of a range of services and facilities within Stalham, which is identified as a 'Small Growth Town' within the proposed settlement hierarchy. It comments that Sutton is capable of accommodating more than the 20 dwellings anticipated by draft Policy SD3 and in doing so can deliver community benefits. Requesting that the restriction of between 0 – 20 dwellings for small villages be deleted from the policy and be replaced by a criteria based approach to assessing settlement suitability and requirements to accommodate additional growth.

Services/facilities review: no changes.

Constraints: no changes. It is noted that at least four of the alternative sites partly or wholly fall within flood zone 2.

Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites, 6 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 8 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.

Conclusion: Sutton continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a SGV.

Trunch:

Summary Regulation 18 Comments:

Individuals: (LP157, LP205, LP409, LP428) Objects that if all the development goes ahead in Mundesley as planned there is a danger that Trunch will no longer be identifiable as an individual village with its own unique characteristics. Remaining as a countryside village gives greater control to the local community in 'exceptions' and providing social housing whilst still retaining its individual identity. Trunch has a conservation area at its heart so any new development would need to be on the fringes. Currently, Trunch has quite a low water pressure in the village. Any further development in Trunch or the surrounding areas will only increase that problem. The new sewerage plant at Swafield will only reduce current problems it will not solve future problems caused by new housing developments. The infrastructure needs to be put in place before any development can reasonably be considered. Return Trunch to a countryside classification.

Services/facilities review: no changes.

Constraints: no changes. Surface water flooding is largely restricted to existing roads.

Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites & HELAA, 8 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 4 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.

Conclusion: Trunch continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a SGV.

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

Walcott:
Summary Regulation 18 Comments: Individuals: (LP603) Objects stating that Walcott should not be categorised as a growth village due to issues relating to 2nd homes, affordability, impact on infrastructure, public transport and traffic. Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP803) Hopkins Homes comments that Walcott indicates a lack of any available sites in the HELAA, that its location is almost entirely within the Coastal Erosion Zone and that it is in close proximity to the higher order settlement of Bacton.
Services/facilities review: no changes. Constraints: no changes. The majority of the settlement is located within Flood Zones 2 and/or 3A. Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites, 1 site has been recorded as an alternative site for housing development located in Walcott Green.
Conclusion: Walcott continues to meet the requirements to be identified as a SGV, but environmental constraints restrict the likely deliverability of development and so its growth should not be relied upon to meet strategic needs.

West Runton:
Summary Regulation 18 Comments: Individuals: (LP409) Objects that building in small growth villages as identified in Policy SD3 has the danger of allowing 'urban sprawl' which results in East and West Runton becoming an extension of Sheringham and Cromer. Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP803) Hopkins Homes supports that the village of West Runton (along with other identified SGV's) is capable of sustaining a development in excess of 27 additional dwellings. (LP478) EA comments that it has no concerns for West Runton Water Recycling Centre (WRC).
Services/facilities review: no changes. Constraints: no changes. It is noted that there is differing levels of surface water flooding associated with the alternative sites. Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites, 3 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 2 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.
Conclusion: West Runton continues to meet the criteria to be identified as a SGV.

Appendix 1 Policy SD3 - Small Growth Villages (SGV) Review

Weybourne:

Summary Regulation 18 Comments:

Individuals: (LP771) Objects stating that Weybourne should not be a small growth village because (a) an inadequate bus service for working people; (b) the future of the village shop is in doubt (up for sale); (c) increasing proportion of second homes and holiday lets as likelihood that new development would be beyond the price of local people along with breakdown of community; (d) Weybourne is in the AONB. Increased development would negatively affect this and could damage existing tourism; (e) increased development risks reducing the habitat for wildlife. This would potentially conflict with international agreements to which the UK is a signatory; (f) inadequate parking in the village. Further development would increase pressure.

PC & TC's: (LP168) Weybourne PC objects stating that Weybourne should retain its' designation as Countryside and should not be designated as a SGV due to the following factors: the lack of a full-time shop in the village and uncertainty regarding its future (up for sale); Lack of infrastructure, including but not limited to lack of places at local GP Surgeries and distance from a major hospital; the lack of a bus service in the village (out of season, the bus service in Weybourne is limited); The limits of the drainage infrastructure in the village; The quality of the roads in and out of the village; The need for Affordable Housing in the village; The high proportion of second homes already in the village. As a village with over 40% of houses either second homes or holiday homes, this has a huge impact on the sustainability of the village.

Statutory Bodies & Organisations: (LP803) Hopkins Homes comments that Weybourne is constrained by being within the AONB and location within the setting of Sheringham Park. Based on a lack of available or suitable sites, low developer interest and environmental constraints, it should be concluded that Weybourne (along with 7 other villages listed) is poorly placed to deliver any meaningful growth towards the minimum 400 home target set for the Small Growth Village tier.

Services/facilities review: no changes.

Constraints: no changes. It is noted that the northernmost alternative site WEY13 and WEY02/A fall partly within flood zones 2 and/or 3a.

Land Supply: As part of the Call for Sites & HELAA, 6 sites have been recorded as alternative sites for housing development and 5 additional sites have been submitted under Regulation 18.

Conclusion: Weybourne continues to meet the criteria as a SGV.