# Surlingham, Bramerton & Kirby Bedon Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites December 2022

## Contents

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

#### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5017
Site address	Land north of East Hill Lane, Bramerton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.18
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	9-13 dwellings 28 dph
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	Νο
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	Promoter proposing using the two existing accesses from Easthill Lane one for 6-10 dwellings and one further west for 3 dwellings. These are currently field accesses and would need up-grading. The lane is very narrow, single carriageway, with no footpath or lighting. NCC Highways – Amber. Access would require hedge removal, carriageway widening / footway at frontage. Poor local network with no footway to catchment school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities Part 1: • Primary School • Secondary school • Local healthcare services • Retail services • Local employment	Amber	Distance to school and shop in Surlingham 2.5km along mainly rural roads often with very poor provision for pedestrians Distance to No.85 frequent bus service 550 metres with no footways	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
opportunities • Peak-time public transport			
<ul> <li>Part 2:</li> <li>Part 1 facilities, plus</li> <li>Village/ community hall</li> <li>Public house/ café</li> <li>Preschool facilities</li> <li>Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	<ul> <li>1.2k to Water's Edge public house. The Ferry House and Coldham Hall public houses in Surlingham are both over 3km away.</li> <li>Village Hall and recreation area is adjacent</li> </ul>	Green
Utilities Capacity		Promoter advises; Water supply is available on the north boundary from Bramerton Lodge to the neighbouring single dwelling. An incoming electric supply from the south is above ground. At the site's southern boundary, the electric supply is underground along the east boundary and the Electric substation.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	None known or identified.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
ldentified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1 Some low to medium surface water risk within the site to the east and	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		west along the adjacent access driveway.	
		LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints, on-site flood risk is localised ponding. Standard information required at planning stage.	
		Environment Agency: Green	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001) Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (Land Use Consultants 2001)	N/A	Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification: Grade 2-3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Whilst the site is not visible in the wider landscape as it is well contained, it is an important site within this rural enclave focused around the village hall. When travelling west the narrow Lane takes you along the treed conservation area frontage with only intermittent houses to the south. Passing the driveways to Lodge Cottages, to the south and Bramerton Lodge to the north the lane is undeveloped. Developing the site would not relate well to the character of this area.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Broads Authority: Approx. 250m from BA boundary. On higher ground. Probably not visible from the river/moorings/parking due to topography and tree cover, although some Broads visitors could pass the site on their way to these attractions.	
Townscape	Red	There is a small group of dwellings around the junction with Surlingham Road however these are sporadic. A more intense development would not be in character and, if it were, would be more appropriate along the larger Surlingham Road than this narrow Lane.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. There is potential for habitats which would require further investigation. NCC Ecologist: Amber. Just off GI corridor. No priority habitat identified onsite. Residential development of 50 units or more. Rural Residential, or any residential development of 50 or more houses outside existing settlements/urban areas, or where water discharge is greater that 5m3/day requires NE consultation. Ponds nearby and site in amber risk zone for great crested newts. Norfolk Wildlife Trust: Note that this site may be supporting species-rich grassland and this is possibly Priority Habitat. If site is to be taken forward this requires further investigation. Recommend ecological surveys for this site.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Adjacent to the conservation area, shares eastern boundary. It would have an impact on the setting of the conservation area to the east.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		HES - Amber	
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space. Bramerton Tennis Court to north- east, not affected.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Easthill lane is a single carriageway with no passing places and the connecting road network is very constrained. Additional traffic would have a negative impact on the functioning of the highway. NCC Highways – Red. Access would require hedge removal, carriageway widening / footway at frontage. Poor local network with no footway to catchment school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and recreation, some residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of this site would impact on the conservation area as it would alter the setting on the approach from the west.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?		N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Small agricultural/paddocks. No buildings.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to south, village hall to east and residential, Bramerton Lodge, properties. Compatible uses.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Between the paddocks there is approx. 1m level change.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature trees, less dense to south and north.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Yes, woodland area and mature trees, pond to east.	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 on site, unlikely given paddock use.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into and out of the site are limited by site boundaries and trees. Also by the narrow width of the road, which is the public viewpoint.	N/A
<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)	Not recommended to allocate as it is remote from services such as the village school and the road network is limited with no paths to get to others. It does not reflect the way this small group has grown incrementally. If the site was to be considered then the views of the	Red

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	highway authority would be needed as to whether suitable access can be achieved as well as an assessment of the level of harm to the setting of the conservation area.	

#### 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)
Norwich Policy Area		N/A
Adjacent to the conservation area		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Some conflict with the conservation area designation	Amber

### Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Νο	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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
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)	Access improvements including likely road widening, possible footpath.	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	N/A

#### Part 7 - Conclusion

#### Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated.

#### **Site Visit Observations**

The site accessed via field gates and would need up-grading. East Hill Lane is very narrow, single carriageway, with no footpath or lighting. remote from services such as the village school and the road network are limited with no paths to get to others. It does not reflect the way this small group has grown incrementally. If the site was to be considered, then the views of the highway authority would be needed as to whether suitable access can be achieved as well as an assessment of the level of harm to the setting of the conservation area.

#### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to development boundary and conservation area.

#### Availability

Promoter states that the site is available.

#### Achievability

No further constraints identified.

#### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for development, due to its constrained access; Easthill lane is a single carriageway with no passing places and the connecting road network is very constrained. This is exacerbated by the remoteness of the site from services that are not accessible by a footway. Additional traffic would have a negative impact on the functioning of the highway. Development in this location would also have some impact on the adjoining Conservation Area and on the Broads area. Whilst there is a small group of dwellings located around the Surlingham Road junction, these are sporadic, and a more intense development would not be in character.

Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 28/04/2022