

Hales, Heckingham, Langley Street,  
Carleton St Peter, Claxton,  
Raveningham & Sisland  
Village Cluster  
Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

# Contents

SN5046SL .....	3
----------------	---

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5046SL
Site address	Land east of The Cottage, St John's Lane, Sisland
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2019/1652/F for replacement dwelling refused 31/10/2019, appeal dismissed 24/02/2021. 2017/1874/F for replacement dwelling refused 09/10/2017.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.19
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	1-2 dwellings 5 at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

**ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS** (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
Locally Designated Green Space	No

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

The RED/ AMBER/ GREEN score in the HELAA Score column below is based upon the assessment criteria set out in Appendix A of the 'Norfolk Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (July 2016)' methodology.

#### Site Score:

Where a HELAA Assessment has indicated either a RED or AMBER score, has the promoter of the site submitted any supporting evidence to indicate that the issues can be overcome (e.g., a Flood Risk Assessment, Contaminated Land Survey, Ecological Survey)? If yes, and if appropriate, note any changes to the HELAA score in the Site Score column. Additional criteria have been included under 'Accessibility to local services and facilities' and 'Landscape', which need to be reflected in the Site Score.

*(Please note boxes filled with grey should not be completed)*

#### SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access is via an unmade track off Church Farm Road. There is an existing access, but it would need to be improved.  NCC Highways – Red. Insufficient information to comment. Suspect remote with poor network.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Loddon is to the east with services approximate distances;  1,900m Junior school 2,000m Medical Centre 2,200m High School 2,300m Infant and nursery  However, the majority of these are over the distances considered to be walkable, in addition the lack of footpaths, unlit narrow roads make it dangerous for pedestrians. Therefore, the vast majority of journeys would be using a vehicle.	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	2,150m Playing fields 2,300m Community hall	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known capacity issues.  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains electric and potable water connections exist.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Under Consideration for further upgrades.	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Original use residential but derelict now. Environmental Quality did not have any significant concerns when consulted on recent application.  <b>NCC Minerals &amp; Waste</b> - site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that - future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Red	Flood Zone Surface water flooding; High and medium risk running diagonally	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>through the centre of the site.</p> <p>LLFA – Amber. Would not prevent development but significant mitigation required. The site is affected by minor ponding in the 3.33% AEP event, a minor/ moderate flow path in the 1.0% AEP event and moderate/major flow path in the 0.1% AEP event. The flow path cuts the site southeast-west. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows east off of the site. This needs to be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>A large area of the site is affected by flood risk. This needs to be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>Any water leading from off-site to on-site should be considered as part of any drainage strategy for the site.</p> <p>Access to the site may be affected by the on-site and off-site flood risk.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	B5 - Chet Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Tributary Farmland  Agricultural Land Classification: non-agricultural land	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	This previously developed plot is now uninhabited, and the very modest traditional cottage is derelict. More than doubling the amount of development and moving it up the slope, as would be required to avoid the surface water flood risk, would increase its	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		prominence and impact on the landscape in this remote location.	
Townscape	Amber	The site is separate from any built-up area and is in the countryside which is characterised by farm-houses and small groups of houses. However, it would reflect the location of the other properties which are to the north of this track.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designations.</p> <p>Two ponds within 500m, derelict buildings, mature trees and hedges. An ecology report was submitted with the application – no significant effects noted, bat survey and mitigation would be required.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Green. Off PROW Sisland FP2 (consult PROW Officer). SSSI IRZ but residential not identified requiring NE consultation. Discharge of water &gt;20m<sup>3</sup>/day to seep away or surface water requires NE consultation. Not in GI corridor.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No heritage assets affected.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	<p>Along unmade track from Church Farm Road which is a single-track lane that connects to Mundham Road/Loddon Road.</p> <p>Sisland Footpath 2 runs along the track.</p> <p>No footpaths or street-lights in the vicinity.</p>	Red



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		NCC Highways – Red. Insufficient information to comment. Suspect remote with poor network.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	None	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	There is an access which would need to be improved and would require the removal of some of the hedge.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	There is a derelict cottage on site which has not been occupied for 60 years. Whether or not there is a lawful residential use has been under debate in the recent Appeal. The Appeal for a replacement dwelling was dismissed.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agriculture – compatible uses.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	On a slope, with higher ground to north (rear).	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature trees and established hedges.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Two small ponds in vicinity. Vegetation as above.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	None evident.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Because the site is off the adopted highway the views are limited.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p><b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>The site is remote from any settlement and the only access is along an unadopted, unlit track and road with no street-lights.</p> <p>Whilst there was once a small dwelling here it is derelict and has not been lived in for around 60 years. A modern dwelling would alter the site significantly, have a far greater impact on the landscape and encroach into the countryside. There is also an issue with surface water flooding.</p>	<p>Red</p>

## Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

Local Plan Designations, including those in Neighbourhood Plans, should be noted in the table below (excluding Open Countryside which will apply to all sites promoted outside the Development Limits).

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
None		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)  Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Immediately	Green
Comments:		N/A

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unlikely	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it will be provided. Site is under the threshold.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## **Part 7 - Conclusion**

### **Suitability**

Promoted as an extension to the Settlement Limit however there is no Settlement Limit for Sisland and there are no plans to designate one. The site contains a small dwelling, now derelict. Applications for replacement dwellings have previously been refused, the most recent having been dismissed at appeal in 2021. The proposal is for two dwellings which would need to be located to a more visually prominent part of the site to avoid flood risk. The site is at the limits of distances to services and the issue is compounded by the route being a mix of narrow, unlit country lanes and the more heavily trafficked Mundham Road, all of which have no footways and are subject to the national speed limit; furthermore, the main local services are in Loddon, which requires crossing the A146 at a busy roundabout junction. The access track to the site is part of the PRoW network.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is remote from any settlement and the only access is along an unadopted, unlit track and road with no street-lights.

Whilst there was once a small dwelling here it is derelict and has not been lived in for around 60 years. A modern dwelling would alter the site significantly, have a far greater impact on the landscape and encroach into the countryside. There is also an issue with surface water flooding.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

### **Achievability**

No additional supporting evidence submitted.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE site for either a SL Extension or for allocation as it is an unsustainable location. The site relates poorly to the existing services which are all over 2km away. These are more than the distances considered to be readily walkable and, in this case, the lack of any footpaths on the rural, unlit narrow roads makes it dangerous for pedestrians. It would encroach into the countryside and have some impact on the landscape. In addition, improving the access (which is a PRoW) would necessitate the removal of part of a hedgerow. Surface water flooding would require mitigation.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 29/04/2022