## UNREASONABLE SITES – NON-RESIDENTIAL
(SOUTH NORFOLK AND BROADLAND)
NORWICH URBAN AREA FRINGE PARISHES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Reason considered to be unreasonable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of East Anglia, Colney</td>
<td>GNLP0140-A</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Proposed clubhouse, pavilion and pitch site</td>
<td>This site is not preferred for allocation as consent has already been granted under planning application reference 2016/0233.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of East Anglia, Colney</td>
<td>GNLP0140-B</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Proposed car park extension</td>
<td>This site is not preferred for allocation as consent has already been granted under planning application reference 2016/0233.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-east of Norfolk &amp; Norwich University Hospital</td>
<td>GNLP0331R-A</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>Employment-led mixed use</td>
<td>This site is not preferred for allocation due to townscape and landscape constraints. It currently acts as an area of open land between the hospital and existing/proposed residential development. There are also high voltage power lines running across the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Colney Lane, Cringleford</td>
<td>GNLP0244</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>University related</td>
<td>This site is not preferred for allocation due to landscape constraints and concern about the loss of open space. Development in this location would significantly change the character of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costessey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costessey Park and Ride, Bawburgh</td>
<td>GNLP0376</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Employment &amp; Commercial use</td>
<td>To justify a local plan allocation in this location more evidence is needed of likely end-user businesses who would bring forward development, as well as evidence to show there is no conflict with the overarching Transport for Norwich strategy. Without this information the site is not considered to be suitable for allocation at the current time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cringleford (including Keswick)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A140/Mulbarton Road, Keswick</td>
<td>GNLP3047</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as evidence suggests that currently committed land is more than sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the employment growth needs in Greater Norwich. There is therefore no need to allocate any additional large-scale employment sites in the new local plan. This area is outside the planning application boundary for the extended KES2 allocation in the South Norfolk Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drayton Land off Norwich Northern Distributor Road, Felthorpe</td>
<td>GNLP0465</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as evidence suggests that currently committed land is more than sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the employment growth needs in Greater Norwich. There is therefore no need to allocate any additional large-scale employment sites in the new local plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton and Honingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellesdon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Hellesdon Park Industrial Estate, Hellesdon</td>
<td>GNLP2142</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>Extension to industrial estate, burial ground, open space, car park</td>
<td>This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as evidence suggests that currently committed land is more than sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the employment growth needs in Greater Norwich. There is therefore no need to allocate any additional large-scale employment sites in the new local plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Catton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rackheath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sprowston</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taverham and Ringland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thorpe St Andrew</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trowse (including Bixley and Whitlingham)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Reason considered to be unreasonable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aylsham (Blickling, Burgh &amp; Tuttington and Oulton)</strong></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diss (including part of Roydon)</td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Road, Diss</td>
<td>GNLP2067</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>Repair and retail warehouse, business and offices</td>
<td>The site is not preferred for allocation as it is subject to flood risk constraints and it is considered that there is already sufficient employment land allocated in Diss in the current South Norfolk Local Plan still to be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redenhall with Harleston</td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hethel Strategic Employment</td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Potash Lane, Bracon Ash</td>
<td>GNLP2097</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>This site is proposed for employment to be used by Tml Precision Engineering and other local businesses. As of spring 2018, the promoter reports that the industrial development permitted is nearing completion (planning reference: 2011/1041). The development by Tml Precision Engineering will create 3,000 sqm of employment space, complementing the existing long-standing advanced engineering activities in Hethel. Given the existing planning permission and current build out it is not necessary to consider the site further for allocation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Long Stratton (including part of Roydon)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Reason considered to be unreasonable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tharston Industrial Estate, Long Stratton</td>
<td>GNLP0272</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>This site is promoted as an extension to the Tharston Industrial Estate and would be in addition to employment land already allocated in the Long Stratton Area Action Plan (policy LNGS2). This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as evidence suggests that currently committed land is more than sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the employment growth needs in Greater Norwich. There is therefore no need to allocate any additional large-scale employment sites in the new local plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Wymondham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Reason considered to be unreasonable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land north of Carpenters Barn, Wymondham</td>
<td>GNLP0285</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>Recreational Use</td>
<td>This site is not preferred for allocation as consent has already been granted under planning application reference 2014/0799 for a clubhouse with sports pitches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanfield Road, Wymondham</td>
<td>GNLP0116</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>This proposal appears to be for the expansion of operations at the Goff Petroleum Fuel Depot as per expired planning permission 2010/2232 for offices, workshops, warehousing and distribution. Due to the specific nature of these proposals and the depot's location some distance from the built-up area of Wymondham this site is not considered to be suitable for allocation and would be better dealt with through the planning application process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## KEY SERVICE CENTRES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Reason considered to be unreasonable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blofield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brundall (including Postwick)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land south of A1042 Yarmouth Road, Postwick</td>
<td>GNLP0371</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>This site is not preferred for allocation as consent has already been given under planning application reference 20180504.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Brundall Memorial Hall, Brundall</td>
<td>GNLP2069</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>Recreation and Leisure</td>
<td>A planning application on this site (reference 20171386) for 170 dwellings, sports pavilion, country park and outdoor recreation was refused in July 2019. This means that existing open space allocation BRU3 from the Broadland Local Plan will be carried forward but on a smaller boundary than this site. It is not proposed to enlarge the area of the BRU3 allocation so this site is considered to be unreasonable for allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent Postwick Interchange, Postwick with Witton</td>
<td>GNLP3029</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Mixed use including leisure, roadside, retail</td>
<td>This site is well located, being surrounded on all sides by strategically important roads. To the immediate west is the Postwick Interchange and the site itself would be accessed from the A1042. At the time of writing a planning application (reference 20190300) has been submitted for a petrol filling station and two drive through restaurants. This site is not preferred for allocation as it is recognised that a proposal of this nature is better dealt with through the development management process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land North of Yarmouth Road, Brundall</td>
<td>GNLP3049</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>This site has the potential to provide local employment opportunities but is not preferred for allocation at the current time. To justify a local plan allocation in this location more evidence would be required about the need for the proposal and how it would be delivered. A proposal of this scale would probably be better dealt with through the planning application process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hethersett (including Thickthorn)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land around Thickthorn Roundabout. Either side of A11</td>
<td>GNLP0177-BR / GNLP0358R</td>
<td>134.00</td>
<td>Outdoor leisure, residential care assisted living, renewable energy generation</td>
<td>This site is not preferred for allocation as although the A11 is strategically important for growth there are already significant allocations and commitments in place nearby at Colney, Cringleford and Hethersett and further land of this scale is not needed at the current time. This site includes heritage assets such Thickthorn Hall set within historic parkland. It is also within the strategic gap separating Hethersett and Cringleford and the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land north of Norwich Road, Hethersett</td>
<td>GNLP0486</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as evidence suggests that currently committed land is more than sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the employment growth needs in Greater Norwich. There is therefore no need to allocate any additional large-scale employment sites in the new local plan. Development in this location would impact on the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone and the strategic gap between Hethersett and Cringleford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Melton Business Park - Site A (land to west)</td>
<td>GNLP1023-A</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>Food-led industrial</td>
<td>This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as evidence suggests that currently committed land is more than sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the employment growth needs in Greater Norwich. There is therefore no need to allocate any additional large-scale employment sites in the new local plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Melton Business Park - Site B (land to east)</td>
<td>GNLP1023-B</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>Food-led industrial</td>
<td>This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as evidence suggests that currently committed land is more than sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the employment growth needs in Greater Norwich. There is therefore no need to allocate any additional large-scale employment sites in the new local plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Land to the south of the A146, Loddon

- **GNLP0347**
- **Area:** 3.41ha
- **Uses:** Storage and distribution hub

This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as it is disconnected from the built edge of Loddon and there are concerns that it is not possible to achieve a suitable access. In addition, evidence suggests that current committed land is more than sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the employment growth needs in Greater Norwich meaning there is no need to allocate any additional large scale employment sites in the new local plan.

### Poringland (including Bixley)

- **Park Farm, Bungay Road, Bixley**
- **GNLP0323**
- **Area:** 9.83ha
- **Uses:** Employment & Commercial use

This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as evidence suggests that currently committed land is more than sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the employment growth needs in Greater Norwich. There is therefore no need to allocate any additional large-scale employment sites in the new local plan.

Constraints on development include highways access, surface water flood risk on part of the site, and heritage issues to the setting of the Church of St Wandregelius (Grade II* listed).

### Reepham

- **The Old Rectory Meadow, Reepham**
- **GNLP1007**
- **Area:** 1.69ha
- **Uses:** Infrastructure extension

This site is not preferred for allocation as no identified need exists and this proposal could be dealt with by a planning application if needed.

### Wroxham

NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Reason considered to be unreasonable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BROADLAND VILLAGE UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blofield Heath and Hemblington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxton with Lamas and Brampton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cawston, Brandiston and Swannington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coltishall, Horstead with Stanninghall and Belaugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foulsham and Themelthorpe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frettenham</td>
<td>Adjacent 10 Buxton Road, Frettenham</td>
<td>GNLP2076</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freethorpe, Halvergate and Wickhampton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great and Little Plumstead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Octagon Business Park, Gt &amp; Lt Plumstead</td>
<td>GNLP2107</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>Office, storage</td>
<td>This site has the potential to provide local employment opportunities but is not preferred for allocation at the current time. To justify a local plan allocation in this location more evidence would be required about the need for the proposal and how it would be delivered. A proposal of this scale would probably be better dealt with through the planning application process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Brook Farm, Gt &amp; Lt Plumstead</td>
<td>GNLP3034</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>Employment B1, B2, B8</td>
<td>This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as evidence suggests that currently committed land is more than sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the employment growth needs in Greater Norwich. There is therefore no need to allocate any additional large-scale employment sites in the new local plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Witchingham, Lenwade, Weston Longville, Alderford, Attlebridge, Little Witchingham and Morton on the Hill</td>
<td>GNLP2144</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>This site is proposed for industrial development and would be accessed from the nearby roundabout with the Broadland Northway, however there are concerns about the suitability of the access. The site could potentially provide local opportunities but to justify a local plan allocation in this location more evidence would be needed about the likely end user businesses who would bring forward development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hainford and Stratton Strawless

NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES

Hevingham

NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES

Horsford
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>GNLP No</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glebe Farm North, Horsford</td>
<td>GNLP2133</td>
<td>26.23</td>
<td>Employment/mixed</td>
<td>This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as evidence suggests that currently committed land is more than sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the employment growth needs in Greater Norwich. There is therefore no need to allocate any additional large-scale employment sites in the new local plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Drayton Lane, Horsford</td>
<td>GNLP2154</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>Retail/car parking</td>
<td>This site is promoted specifically for a supermarket with associated car parking. The site is not preferred for allocation as it is not within an accessible walking distance of Horsford and there is no evidence of an end user being in place to assure delivery of the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham and Newton St Faith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingwood and Burlingham, Strumpshaw and Beighton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reedham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salhouse, Woodbastwick and Ranworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spixworth and Crostwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH NORFOLK VILLAGE UNREASONABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Little Green, Bunwell</td>
<td>GNLP0224</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>This is a freestanding site some distance from the village core and not particularly well related to the settlement. There are no known end-user businesses and therefore the site is not considered to be suitable for allocation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Gillingham (including Haddiscoe)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Details</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Employment/Commercial</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willow Farm, Haddiscoe</td>
<td>GNLP0455</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>This is a small remote site located in the northern part of the parish towards Lower Thurlton. It is not considered to be suitable for allocation as it located within fluvial flood zones 2 and 3 and is therefore heavily constrained. It has been proposed for employment uses connected to the adjacent business and would be better to come forward through the planning application process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mulbarton (including Bracon Ash, East Carleton, and Hethel)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Details</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Employment/Commercial</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land off Station Lane, Ketteringham</td>
<td>GNLP0245</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as evidence suggests that currently committed land is more than sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the employment growth needs in Greater Norwich. There is therefore no need to allocate any additional large-scale employment sites in the new local plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Newton Flotman (including Swainsthorpe)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Details</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Employment/Commercial</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wymondham Road, East Carleton</td>
<td>GNLP2165</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>This site is not preferred for allocation as its remoteness to core services and the inadequacy of the road network are significant constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Area (Ha)</td>
<td>Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land West of A140, Adjacent Hickling Lane, Swainsthorpe</td>
<td>GNLP0604R</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>Workshops, stores, offices, agricultural sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seething (including Mundham)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Seething Airfield, Mundham</td>
<td>GNLP0071R</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Ipswich Road, Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>GNLP2158</td>
<td>49.90</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacolneston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacolneston Conservation Area</td>
<td>GNLP0545</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>Preservation as local green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacolneston Manor House Area Local Green Space</td>
<td>GNLP0546</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>Preservation as local green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tivetshall St Mary and St Margaret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former waste transfer station, Tivetshall</td>
<td>GNLP2128</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Retail/petrol station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wreningham (including Ashwellthorpe)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>