

Pulham Market & Pulham St Mary  
Village Cluster  
Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

## Contents

|                |    |
|----------------|----|
| SN0418.....    | 3  |
| SN1052REV..... | 13 |

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

### Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail   | Comments   |
|--|--|
| Site Reference   | SN0418   |
| Site address   | Land at Cook's Field, n/o Jocelyn Close, Pulham Market                     |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated  |
| Planning History   | No relevant history  |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)                                      | 0.66 ha  |
| Promoted Site Use, including<br>(a) Allocated site<br>(b) SL extension | Promoted for allocation  |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 22.7 dph (indicative layout submitted)<br><br>(approximately 15 dwellings) |
| 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       |
| 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                 | <p>There are potential access constraints - narrow lane with shallow verges. NCC to confirm that adequate visibility achievable.</p> <p><b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b></p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - narrow road network and problem junction to the south (Bank Street/ Tattlepot Rd); small scale development may be hard to object to but junction is blind and really very poor; remain concerned about smaller scale development; unlikely to be able to widen the road on the correct side of the road and would require loss of mature tree</p> | Amber                |

| Constraint   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <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> | Green                 | <p>Primary school approx. 1km walking route (no footpath for 90m).</p> <p>GP surgery</p> <p>Limited retail in settlement but includes builders merchants. Farm shop &amp; garden centre nearby but remote from settlement.</p> <p>Employment opportunities within settlement</p> <p>2 bus operators run daytime services daily between settlement and Norwich ( including peak time)</p> |                      |
| <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <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>   |                       | <p>Village hall</p> <p>2 public houses within settlement</p> <p>2 cafes in farm/garden centres which are remote from settlement</p> <p>Pre-school in village hall</p> <p>Site close to recreation ground</p>   | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity   | Amber                 | Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed   | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                 | Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site   | Green                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk   |                       | Site within the area already served by fibre technology  | Green                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route  |                       | Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location   | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability   | Green                 | The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues   | Green                |
| Flood Risk   | Amber                 | Flood zone 1 but identified flood risk along Mill Lane which would need to be considered. Wide ditch in verge along highway boundary.  | Green                |

| Impact  | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Type<br><i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>           | N/A                   | Plateau Farmland   | N/A                  |
| SN Landscape Character Area<br><i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i> |                       | E4: Great Moulton Plateau<br><br>ALC Grade TBC   |                      |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                      | Green                 | Site visually contained in views from north and wider views from east however the site is of significant size  | Amber                |
| Townscape   | Green                 | Development would represent a breakout to north but a reduced scale and visual containment of site would limit its impact.<br><br><b>Senior Conservation &amp; Design Officer</b> – Green. Straightforward extension of settlement, however starting to get quite far out from centre, in what is quite a clustered village. | Green                |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity                                       | Amber                 | Ecology report submitted. Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated   | Amber                |
| Historic Environment  | Amber                 | Development would not have detrimental impact on designated heritage assets<br><br><b>Senior Conservation &amp; Design Officer</b> - Green<br><br><b>HES score</b> – Amber   | Green                |
| Open Space  | Green                 | Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space   | Green                |
| Transport and Roads   | Amber                 | Narrow land with shallow verges. NCC to confirm where sufficient for increased capacity<br><br><b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>   | Amber                |

| Impact                    | HELAA Score<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments                    | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Neighbouring<br>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?   | Very well separated from heritage assets to east. Unlikely to impact on character or setting subject to boundary treatments and overall heights. A reduced scale would reduce the townscape impact.            | N/A                  |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?  | Existing field access at southern end. Narrow lane (observed that two vehicles cannot pass without mounting narrow verge). NCC to confirm if adequate for increased capacity and off-site improvements needed. | N/A                  |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)  | Agriculture  | N/A                  |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)   | Compatible - residential to south<br><br>Agriculture   | N/A                  |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)  | Flat   | N/A                  |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)   | Hedgerow to N, S & W. Open to larger parcel of farmland on E side  | N/A                  |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?  | Continuous hedgerow to N, W & S. No significant trees. Wide ditch between hedge and road frontage  | 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) | No evidence  | N/A                  |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape  | Prominent in views along Mill Lane in both directions. Part of larger parcel which is then visually contained  | N/A                  |



| Site Visit Observations   | Comments  | Site Score<br>(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>Development would represent limited breakout to north but would be contained from wider views. Consider suitable for allocation subject to mitigation of constraints</p> | <p>Amber</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) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
|                                   |   | N/A                  |
|                                   |   | N/A                  |
|                                   |   | N/A                  |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                 | Does not conflict with 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?<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Not to knowledge of promoter | N/A                         |
| When might the site be available for development?   | Immediately                  | Green                       |
| Comments:   |                              | Green                       |

| <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)<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Statement from promoter advising same  | Green                     |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)     | Limited off-site highway improvements may be required. NCC to confirm                            | Amber                     |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?           | Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted | Amber                     |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                     | Footpath link to recreation ground is offered  |                           |

## **Part 7 - Conclusion**

### **Suitability**

Promoted site is of significant size but could be reduced in scale and number reducing its impact within the landscape and on the townscape. Possible highways issues identified.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site on edge of settlement but within reach of services, subject to provision of footpath link to existing at Jocelyn Close. Site visible from road but wider landscape impacts could be mitigated. Overall, limited constraints and site likely to be acceptable, subject to clarifications as listed.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within open countryside and adjacent to development boundary; no conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified.

### **Achievability**

The site is considered to be achievable.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered reasonable for an allocation of up to 15 dwellings, subject to highways considerations and landscape mitigation. Highways have raised concerns about the potential to form an acceptable access and the suitability of the local highway network. The site is not likely to be suitable for development at higher densities than promoted due to edge of settlement location.

### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 5 June 2020

Officer: Kate Fisher

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

### Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail   | Comments  |
|--|---|
| Site Reference   | SN1052REV   |
| Site address   | Norwich Road, Pulham St Mary                        |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)    | Agricultural land in open countryside – unallocated |
| Planning History   | No planning history                                 |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)                                      | 4.03 hectares                                       |
| Promoted Site Use, including<br>(c) Allocated site<br>(d) SL extension | Allocation  |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)    | 25dph with open space                               |
| 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       |
| 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 | Green                 | <p>Site has extensive highway boundary</p> <p><b>Highways score</b> – Amber. Subject to continuous frontage development with accesses at Norwich Road and frontage footway to link with existing facilities. Access at Poppy's Lane would require widening to 5.5m along with 2m frontage footway between access and Norwich Road. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways meeting</b> - LLFA suggestion would likely be more expensive and complex option and would necessitate the closure of Poppy's Lane - highways prefer the original option but no real issues; no objection to either a new access off Norwich Road (subject to visibility and footpaths) or improved Poppy's Lane junction; private accesses/frontage development onto Norwich Road with estate development to the rear as a 30mph should ideally have frontage development on both sides.</p> | Amber                |

| Constraint   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i><br><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> | Green                 | <p>Primary school at Pulham Market within 1 km of all parts of site linked by footway</p> <p>Employment opportunities (garage) close to site linked by footway</p> <p>Peak time public transport close to site linked by footway</p>   |                      |
| <i>Part 2:</i><br>Part 1 facilities, plus<br><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>   |                       | <p>Community hall (Pennoyers Centre) including café 315 metres with footway</p> <p>Recreation ground 600 metres away linked by footway</p> <p>Public house within settlement has been closed for some years but remains last lawful use of building</p> <p>Pre-school in Pulham Market</p> | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity   | Amber                 | Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed<br>AW advise sewers crossing the site   | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                 | Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site   | Green                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk   |                       | Site within an area already served by fibre technology   | Green                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route  |                       | Not within identified cable route or substation location   | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability   | Green                 | The site is unlikely to be contaminated  | Green                |
| Flood Risk   | Green                 | Some surface water risk on site but likely to be able to be mitigated  | Amber                |

| Impact  | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Type<br><i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>           | N/A                   | Tributary Farmland  | N/A                  |
| SN Landscape Character Area<br><i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i> |                       | B4 Waveney tributary Farmland<br><br>ALC Grade TBC  |                      |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                      | Green                 | Although prominent to users of Norwich Road and Poppys Lane in the wider landscape it is relatively contained by woodland to north of site  | Amber                |
| Townscape   | Amber                 | <p>Would relate relatively well to existing form of development as a result of linear development on southern side of Norwich Road and estate development to east at Goldsmiths Way. Design and scale will be important to ensure compatibility.</p> <p><b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer –</b> Amber. Develops land between Norwich Road and Poppy's Lane previously undeveloped, however south side of Norwich Road is already developed. If developed through one development this will give a very similar character to a long stretch of Norwich road at point of arrival and give the approach to the village quite an estate like feel. May be better developed in smaller parcels starting from closer the village. It is not a good place for public space being not being very central – and next to the main road.</p> | Amber                |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity                                       | Green                 | Any impact should be able to be mitigated   | Green                |
| Historic Environment  | Green                 | <p>No heritage assets affected</p> <p><b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer –</b></p>   | Amber                |



| Impact                 | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
|                        |                       | Amber. Getting closer to Hill Farm to the north and removing its sense of isolation. Could be mitigated against with space/landscaping to north – but large estate style development will have some impact. Amber but close to red.<br><br>HES score – Amber  |                      |
| Open Space             | Green                 | Development of the site would not result in loss of any open space  | Green                |
| Transport and Roads    | Green                 | Norwich Road is main road through village onto which an access should be achievable<br><br>Highways score – Amber. Subject to continuous frontage development with accesses at Norwich Road and frontage footway to link with existing facilities. Access at Poppy's Lane would require widening to 5.5m along with 2m frontage footway between access and Norwich Road. Subject to highway conditions in planning application. | Amber                |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green                 | Residential and agricultural  | Green                |

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations   | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?   | Relates well to existing form and character of village  | N/A                  |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?   | Numerous access solutions should be possible given long highway boundaries with both Norwich Road and Poppy's Lane  | N/A                  |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)  | Agricultural land so no redevelopment / demolition issues   | N/A                  |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)   | Residential properties on opposite (southern) side of Norwich Road. Allotment gardens and residential properties on opposite (eastern) side of Poppys Lane. Woodland to north and agricultural land to north-west. No compatibility issues. | N/A                  |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)  | Relatively level, site is raised from Poppys Lane   | N/A                  |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)   | Hedge along boundary with Norwich Road apart from close to junction with Poppys Lane  | N/A                  |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?  | Protected trees to north of site and one on Norwich Road highway boundary   | 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) | Greenfield – unlikely to be contaminated  | N/A                  |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape  | Site very visible from Norwich Road and Poppys Lane as large open field   | N/A                  |

| Site Visit Observations   | Comments   | Site Score<br>(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>Site is potentially acceptable as an estate development of up to 25 dwellings on land shown by the site promoter as the open space as this relates best to the existing village. However the site will still have quite an impact on approach to village so site SN1027 would be preferable. If it is decided to allocate the site, then the policy wording could require any open space required to be immediately adjacent to the crossroads.</p> | <p>Amber</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) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
|                                   |   | N/A                  |
|                                   |   | N/A                  |
|                                   |   | N/A                  |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                 | Does not conflict with 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 single ownership   | N/A                         |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | No                         | N/A                         |
| When might the site be available for development?   | Immediately/Within 5 years | Green                       |
| Comments:   |                            | Green                       |

| <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)<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery                    | Green                     |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)     | Some small scale works like footway along site frontage likely to be required                  | Amber                     |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?           | Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence | Amber                     |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                     | No   |                           |

## **Part 7 - Conclusion**

### **Suitability**

Too large in submitted form, however if reduced to area shown as open space it could be acceptable.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is very prominent on approach into Pulham St Mary from west. However, development could be designed to relate well to existing form and character and has good access and connectivity. Would need to be much reduced site from that previously promoted.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within open countryside but adjacent to the development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered suitable for allocation. The site is well related to the existing settlement and the services and facilities within it. Development of the site would require highway improvements. The site is prominent in the landscape, reducing the overall scale of development would avoid a significant detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape. Development is preferred to the eastern end of the site.

**Preferred Site:** Yes

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 10 June 2020

Officer: Kate Fisher