

Toft Monks, Aldeby, Haddiscoe,  
Wheatacre & Burgh St Peter  
Village Cluster  
Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

## Contents

SN0414SLREVA.....	3
SN0518.....	13
SN4014.....	24
SN4017.....	32
SN5011SL.....	41
SN5035.....	51
SN5036.....	63
SN5037.....	75

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

**Part 1 - Site Details**

<b>Detail</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0414SLREVA
<b>Site address</b>	Land north of Beccles Road, Haddiscoe
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	1990/0617/O for 2 dwellings refused, appeal dismissed 28/02/1991. 1989/1368/O for 1 dwelling refused 22/08/1989.
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.34
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension</b>	SL extension
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	8
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

**Part 2 - Absolute Constraints**

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

<b>Is the site located in, or does the site include:</b>	<b>Response</b>
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>Access likely from Beccles Road, over a footpath. Would require removal of significant frontage hedge.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways:</b> previous response on a larger site of which this site forms part as follows: A143 frontage would require visibility splays at access in accordance with DMRB, unlikely to be achievable with the available 90m despite there being a 2m footway. The Loke measures at 3.4m on NMB, it wouldn't be feasible for 2 vehicles to pass which would be a particular concern regarding egress from A143, width seems fairly typical over the length of the road. Widening north of the A143 junction doesn't appear feasible. Safe pedestrian access could be formed at A143.</p>	Red

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>	Amber	<p>Distance to Toft Monks Primary School 1.3km</p> <p>Bus service runs past site, bus stop to east with relatively frequent service to Gt Yarmouth, Bungay and Beccles.</p> <p>Limited local employment.</p>	N/A
<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>	N/A	<p>Opposite the village hall/playing field</p> <p>Distance to The Haddiscoe Tavern public house 330 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity		<p>Sewer capacity and local wastewater treatment capacity are potentially constraints.</p> <p>Promoter states that utilities capacity should not be a constraint but no evidence provided.</p>	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that utilities are available due to proximity of adjacent properties.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified 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

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1, no identified flood risk.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>  Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland  Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Contained within the landscape and does not encroach into the open countryside. Access onto the A143 would require removal of frontage hedge which would significantly alter the road frontage which is a strong feature in the landscape of the village.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Relatively well contained within settlement, between built-up parts of the village. It is separated from the proposed development on the opposite side of the road by the A143. Frontage linear development would reflect the surrounding area but it would visually consolidate the village particularly as this part of the site has a strong frontage hedgerow which is prominent in the streetscape.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No designations. Proximity to Broads Area. Mature trees on frontage and hedgeline would provide habitat.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No impact on heritage assets. Closest listed building is 180m.  Previously:  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	A143 is a Corridor of Movement and Parts of local road network are heavily constrained. Await consult with Highway Authority.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential dwelling to east and west, undeveloped land to north, some caravan storage. Agricultural opposite.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact on the historic environment. Some impact on the townscape as this area is undeveloped and is a gap between the two development boundary areas. Removing the mature frontage hedge would had a detrimental impact on the townscape.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Appears achievable, would need to check with the Highway Authority as this is a busy road.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Undeveloped land along frontage, no buildings.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Adjacent land uses, detached properties, are compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat no significant change in levels.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge to frontage with mature trees which make an important contribution to the village, should be retained.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	See above, some habitat but limited within the site.	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 of contamination or infrastructure.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views both into and out of site apart from passing immediately adjacent on road or footpath. But residential development would be prominent here. Limited impact on wider landscape.	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>There are no constraints evident on the site. It is relatively close to the centre of the village but developing this site would mean the loss of this break in development. In addition, the frontage is strong along this north side of the road and the hedge is a prominent feature in the village which is significant.</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 – but owner has received enquiries.	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, promoter has indicated the site is deliverable.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unknown, unlikely.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it will be provided if required.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

**Suitability:** Highway authority concerns raised over previously promoted site, which was a larger but contained the revised site now promoted, in respect of the ability to form a suitable access at this point. Any access would likely require the substantive removal of frontage hedgerow which is prominent local feature.

Potential sewerage and waste water treatment constraints. A143 is an identified corridor of movement and new accesses onto this route would need to be carefully considered in respect of the satisfactory functioning of the local highway network.

**Site Visit Observations:** There are no constraints evident on the site. Site is relatively close to the centre of the village. Developing the site would mean the loss of a break in existing development. The frontage is strong along this north side of the road and the hedge is a prominent feature in the village which is significant. It is likely that this hedge would be lost if the site were developed.

**Local Plan Designations:** None

**Availability:** Site is in private ownership and is available immediately.

**Achievability:** Sewerage and local waste water treatment are potential constraints. Highways authority have raised concerns about whether a suitable access to the site could be achieved. Local concerns about acceptability of hedge removal needed to achieve any access to the site.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The revised site is less than 0.5ha in size is promoted for 8 dwellings. This would mean that it falls below the plan's minimum allocation scale of 12 homes to best ensure the delivery of affordable housing. Therefore the site in isolation the site has been considered as a settlement limit extension.

Whilst relatively unconstrained and with adequate access to services and facilities, following previous highway advice there are concerns about the technical feasibility of achieving an access to the site. Achieving an access would also likely require the removal of a frontage hedge important to the character and appearance of the area. No further details appear to have been submitted to show how this constraint can be overcome. There are also concerns about a further access onto the A143, an identified corridor of movement, in addition to that needed for the adjacent preferred allocation.

Therefore on balance, the site is rejected as being unsuitable for development and is considered UNREASONABLE. If identified issues could be overcome then this decision could be revisited. However, rather than a settlement limit extension, if identified at this stage the site should be allocated in combination with preferred site to ensure maximum delivery of affordable housing and a coherent comprehensive development. However, an allocation of this scale in the Village Cluster plan would only typically be considered where it provided a specific local benefit or has a significant constraint to be overcome.

**Preferred Site: No**

**Reasonable Alternative: No**

**Rejected: Yes**

Date Completed: 29/04/2022

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

**Part 1 - Site Details**

<b>Detail</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0518
<b>Site address</b>	Land at Post Office Road and Beccles Road, Toft Monks
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	None
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	5.2
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension</b>	Allocated site
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	Promoted for between 12 and 50 dwellings, with community/employment uses
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

**Part 2 - Absolute Constraints**

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

<b>Is the site located in, or does the site include:</b>	<b>Response</b>
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>The Highway Authority has advised that an access onto A143 would not be supported. The possibility of creating a suitable access is significantly constrained as Post Office Road is a narrow rural lane which accesses onto A143. Would increase slowing, stopping and turning movements at Post Office Road / A143 junction where visibility is restricted. Local road network is considered to be unsuitable by the Highway Authority. This still applies with a smaller number of dwellings and the suggestion of employment/ community land.</p> <p>Access onto Post Office Road would require road widening to 5.5m, 2m site frontage footway and removal of existing hedge.</p> <p>No continuous footway to catchment school.</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>	Amber	<p>Distance to bus service 100 metres</p> <p>Distance to Glebelands Primary School 1.4km with footway along A143 but intimidating route given nature of road. No footpath on Post Office Road.</p>	N/A
<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>	N/A	<p>No village or community hall within 1.8km</p> <p>Distance to White Lion public house 70 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity		No known constraints	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified 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	<p>Flood Zone 1</p> <p>Small areas around the perimeter of the site and a small area in the south-east are at low risk of surface water flooding, could be mitigated.</p>	Green

<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>  Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland  Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The development would result in erosion of rural character to east of settlement and would extend into the wider countryside particularly in views from Post Office Road approaching from the east and from the south on the A143.  Previously rated as Amber on the previous site assessment, on reflection the impact is unlikely to be able to be substantially mitigated.	Red
Townscape	Amber	There is an adjacent small linear area of development along the A143 but the site does not relate particularly well to the majority of the small, compact village to the west across the A143.  Previously rated as Green on the previous site assessment, on reflection the impact is considered greater than previously assessed.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Limited habitat on site as agricultural field.	Green



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	<p>A143 is a Corridor of Movement. Local road network is considered to be unsuitable by the Highway Authority, constrained by Post Office Road comprising of a narrow lane with no pedestrian facilities.</p> <p>Previously rated as Amber on the initial site assessment, on reflection the impact is considered greater than previously assessed on the basis of likely increase slowing, stopping and turning movements at Post Office Road / A143 junction where visibility is restricted</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development to east of existing settlement could have acceptable relationship in townscape terms but would erode rural character of Post Office Road.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways note that access could only be from Post Office Road and this would require road widening to 5.5 metres, two metre site front frontage footway and removal of existing hedge.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or 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 to west, agricultural land to north, east (beyond belt to trees) and south. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site largely level but falling towards southern boundary.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Belt of trees on eastern boundary, hedgerow along northern boundary with Post Office Road, trees and hedging along boundary with A143. Southern boundary is relatively open.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries.	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 of existing infrastructure or contamination.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site from Post Office Road and A143 at field accesses.	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>Not acceptable due to access issues and intrusion into open landscape along Post Office Road.</p> <p>Toft Monks is small and access to local services by foot is limited due to nature of network with impacts in terms of the number of journeys made by car.</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. No details relating to suggestion of community/employment uses and whether these are required or deliverable.	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Road widening and footway provision would be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has indicated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Site could provide local community village hall, open space and provision of local employment use.	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

**Suitability:** Highway Authority advice states that an access onto A143 would not be supported. The possibility of creating a suitable access is significantly constrained as Post Office Road is a narrow rural lane which accesses onto A143. Increase slowing, stopping and turning movements at Post Office Road / A143 junction where visibility is restricted is a concern. Local road network is also considered to be unsuitable by the Highway Authority.

Concerns that the development would result in erosion of rural character to east of settlement and would extend into the wider countryside particularly in views from Post Office Road approaching from the east and from the south on the A143. Also that, whilst site is adjacent to a small linear area of development along the A143, the site does not relate well to the majority of the small, compact village to the west across the A143.

Whilst there are an acceptable range of services and facilities within an appropriate distance of the site, consistent with the assessment criteria, the quality of access to these facilities is diminished by the absence of localised footpath links and the route to the school being along the busy A146.

**Site Visit Observations:** Access could only be from Post Office Road and this would require road widening to 5.5 metres, two metre site front frontage footway and removal of existing hedge. Development to east of existing settlement could have acceptable relationship in townscape terms but would erode rural character of Post Office Road. Toft Monks is small and access to local services by foot is limited due to nature of network with impacts in terms of the number of journeys made by car.

**Local Plan Designations:** None

**Availability:** Site is in private ownership and is available immediately.

**Achievability:** Access via A143 not considered suitable by highway authority. Access onto Post Office Road would require road widening to 5.5m, 2m site frontage footway and removal of existing hedge. Unclear that this could be achieved within land ownership. Suggestion that site could provide community/employment uses but no detail provided.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** Despite revisions to promotion that suggests a smaller number of dwellings and employment/ community land. Concerns related to the access remain however even at lower number. In particular that Post Office Road is a narrow rural lane which accesses onto A143 and as to whether an increase in slowing, stopping and turning movements at Post Office Road / A143 junction where visibility is restricted would be appropriate.

There are also concerns that the development would erode the rural character to east of settlement and extend into the wider countryside, particularly in views from Post Office Road approaching from the east and from the south on the A143. Also that, whilst site is adjacent to a small linear area of development along the A143, the site does not relate well to the majority of the small, compact village to the west across the A143. There are a limited but acceptable range of local services and facilities within an appropriate distance of the site. However, the quality of access is diminished by the absence of footpaths along the whole route and by the nature of the route to primary school which goes along the busy A146. On balance the site is not considered suitable for development and is therefore an UNREASONABLE alternative for allocation.

**Preferred Site: No**

**Reasonable Alternative: No**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 12 May 2022

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

**Part 1 - Site Details**

<b>Detail</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	SN4014
<b>Site address</b>	Land to east of Common Road and south of Beccles Road, Burgh St Peter
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	No relevant planning history
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.96 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension</b>	Allocation – minimum 12 dwellings
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

**Part 2 - Absolute Constraints**

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

<b>Is the site located in, or does the site include:</b>	<b>Response</b>
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	Access options are constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Green</b> No feasible safe walking route to school.	Green
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>	Red	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School over 5km  Bus service runs past site	Red

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>		Distance to Burgh St Peter village hall 550 metres  Distance to White Lion public house 100 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available  AW advise sewers crossing this site	Amber
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	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified surface water flood risk within small areas of site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Woodland contributes to local landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Site would be detached from other residential areas of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Site consists of an area of woodland <b>NCC Ecology - Amber</b> SSSI IRZ. Land is Priority Habitat - Deciduous woodland. Loss of woodland would lead to fragmentation	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b> No feasible safe walking route to school. No feasible safe walking route to school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Commercial uses to south of site	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Poor relationship with existing areas of residential development	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access may be achievable into site, although likely to involve felling of trees. Pedestrian access is poor.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Area of woodland. No demolition issues and no redevelopment issues other than extensive felling of trees	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Commercial uses to south of site which may result in compatibility issues and would need to be considered further.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees which form part of woodland on boundary	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site is wooded with plenty of habitat potential	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 of existing infrastructure or contamination	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site are limited due to its wooded nature	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 suitable due to loss of woodland as well as distance from primary school	Red

## 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?	Site is in private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		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) (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)	None identified	Green
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 of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## **Part 7 - Conclusion**

### **Suitability**

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated. Highways, landscape and ecology constraints have been identified. Consideration needs to be given towards the neighbouring commercial use.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is wooded which positively contributes to character of area and to local landscape. Site is also remote from many services, including primary school.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but close to development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints have been identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be an unreasonable option for development due to being heavily constrained by mature tree cover, which has been identified as 'Priority Habitat - Deciduous woodland'. The loss of the woodland could lead to fragmentation. The site is also at the limits of accessibility to services in terms of distance, a problem which is exacerbated by the lack of footways. Development would have needed to respect the linear pattern of existing development to the north, otherwise it would have an urbanising effect on this rural location. This would mean that the site would be restricted to frontage development, where there is limited developable land due to surface water flood risk and tree cover.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 5 January 2021

Officer: Kate Fisher

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

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4017
Site address	Land north of Staithe Road, Burgh St Peter
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.64 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocation – minimum 12 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
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	Access options are constrained due to nature of road  <b>NCC Highways – Green</b> No feasible safe walking route to school.	Green
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>	Red	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School over 5km  Bus stops close by- limited service  Local employment (Aldeby Business Park) within 650m of the site	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> 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>		Distance to Burgh St Peter village hall 150 metres  Distance to White Lion public house 400 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	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	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface water flood risk in south-west corner	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained within landscape. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Site is relatively well contained within pattern of settlement	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage sites in close proximity  <b>NCC HES – Green</b> SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and biodiversity net gain. Close to a registered common-Dick's Mount and The Parish Pit	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained as narrow lanes with no footways  <b>NCC Highways – Red</b> No feasible safe walking route to school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is relatively well contained within existing pattern of settlement, but estate development would still be out of character with the surrounding development	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable but likely to result in loss of hedgerow. Pedestrian access is poor	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or 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 southern side of Staithe Road and also to east and west of site. Agricultural land to north. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge along southern boundary with Staithe Road, with some hedging and trees on other boundaries	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on site boundaries	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)	Overhead power cable running east to west across site	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Some views across site from Staithe Road.	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>Not likely to be suitable due to distance from services, particularly schools, and the narrow rural road network</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)
		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?	Site is in private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately/Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		

<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)	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)	None identified	Green
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 of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## **Part 7 - Conclusion**

### **Suitability**

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated. Highway and landscape constraints have been identified.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is located far from many services, including the nearest primary school, along rural lanes with no footway. Relatively well contained within the existing pattern of development in the settlement, albeit not in a location that estate development would be in character.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be a reasonable option for development. Access can be achieved via Staithe Road, however there is existing hedgerow that may need to be removed in order to achieve visibility, this would need to be assessed in accordance with hedgerow regulations. Highways concerns have been raised about the lack of footways and safe walking route to the local primary school. The site is relatively well contained within the existing pattern of development within the settlement and although development of the site would represent a breakout into the countryside to the north of Staithe Road, it is considered that townscape and landscape impacts could be mitigated. It is noted that overhead power cables run east to west across the site and there is an area of surface water flood risk adjacent to the south west corner of the site.

### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 5 January 2021

Officer: Kate Fisher



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

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5011SL
Site address	Land west of The Bungalow, Lily Lane, Aldeby
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2018/2036/CU for equestrian use, approved 20/11/2018.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.23
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	1-2 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	Existing field gate access, would need to be improved would require removal of frontage hedge.  NCC Highways – Amber. Access would require carriageway widening at frontage and hedge removal. Network highly constrained with no footway to local facilities / school.	Amber
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>	Red	Distance to Glebelands Primary School over 5km  Distance to bus service 580 metres, No.86 to Norwich infrequent service.  Distance to Aldby Business Park circa. 300m.	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p><i>Part 2:</i> 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>	N/A	<p>Distance to Burgh St Peter village hall 1.1km</p> <p>Distance to White Lion public house 680 metres</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity		<p>No known utilities constraints.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are all available. No gas and foul drainage is not present in this part of the village, most properties have their own individual treatment facilities.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>No known contamination or ground stability issues.</p> <p><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.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood Zone 1</p> <p>Small area of surface water flood risk</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>on north-east boundary and along the road.</p> <p><b>LLFA:</b> Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>The site is within proximity of 1 known record on internal flooding on Duncow Road. We advise this is considered in the site assessment.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)</p> <p>Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland</p>	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
<p>SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)</p>	N/A	<p>C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3 (Grade 1 to north)</p>	N/A
<p>Overall Landscape Assessment</p>	Green	<p>The site is part of the rural landscape where the lane opens out and is visually separate to the closet dwelling. It would have a significant impact.</p> <p><b>Broads Authority:</b> Small site. On upland 'peninsula' with river valleys to north and south but BA boundary 700m to south, and 1400m to north so visibility unlikely.</p>	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	This site is part of the countryside and is not well related to the rest of the village. A wooded area separates it from the settlement boundary.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity. Limited potential – currently a paddock.  <b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. SSSI IRZ- Natural England need to be consulted for residential development of 50 units or more, or any residential development of 50 or more houses outside existing settlements/urban areas, or where discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 5m <sup>3</sup> /day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream. Amber zone for great crested newts (ponds within 250m), not in GI corridor and no priority habitat onsite.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets evident in close proximity.  <b>HES:</b> Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained consisting of narrow lanes with no footways.  <b>NCC Highways:</b> Red. Access would require carriageway widening at frontage and hedge removal. Network highly constrained with no footway to local facilities / school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/paddock and dwelling each side, although not immediately adjacent.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	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?	<p>There is an existing gate to the paddock, but visibility splays would be required which would result in loss of a rural hedge and would change the nature of this rural road.</p> <p>Lily Lane is a very narrow single-track road with no formal passing places.</p>	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural/paddock	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	North and south – agricultural. Trees, dwelling to east and dispersed dwelling to west.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Strong native hedge to north along road, mature trees to east, open to south and west.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedge and trees provide habitat, off site pond to south-east and large pond to south-west.	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)	Electricity and telephone.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views in and out from north, road side. Wider views to south.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	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 separate from the main part of the village, both visually and physically due to the wooded area adjacent. Also because of the narrow rural road. Development here would have a negative impact on the landscape. The site does not have access to limited range of local services and facilities, but access is much more limited due to the constraints of the local highway network.</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 – but enquiries received.	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	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	No	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Under threshold.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

**Suitability:** Highways advice identified that the local network is highly constrained and direct access would require carriageway widening at frontage with hedge removal. Highways advice also raised concerns about lack of footway access to local facilities and school.

Local Flood Authority advice identifies that the site is within proximity of 1 known record on internal flooding on Duncow Road but no overall concern raised on flooding. Ecology advice indicates that discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 5m<sup>3</sup>/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream. Amber zone for great crested newts (ponds within 250m).

The site is part of the rural landscape where the lane opens out and is visually separate to the closet dwelling and is not well related to the rest of the village. Its development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

**Site Visit Observations:** The site is separate from the main part of the village, both visually and physically due to the wooded area adjacent. Also because of the narrow rural road. Development here would have a negative impact on the landscape and creation of an access would require the removal of a rural hedge to achieve visibility splays. There suitability of the site is limited due to the constraints of the local highway network.

**Local Plan Designations:** None

**Availability:** Privately owned and available immediately.

**Achievability:** At the least would require road widening to create a suitable access. Unclear whether this could be achieved within land ownership and unlikely to be achievable without unacceptable impacts on local landscape.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** This is a small site of sufficient scale to only be considered as a settlement limit extension. The site however not a natural extension of the settlement boundary as it forms part of the rural landscape where Lily lane opens out and is visually separate to the closet dwelling by virtue of adjacent wooded area. The site is on the periphery of and therefore not well related to the rest of the village. As such its development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

There are also concerns about the ability to form a suitable access to the site without removal of a rural hedgerow that is characteristic of the area. The wider road network is not considered suitable to accommodate further development and access to the local services is significantly diminished by narrow rural form of that network. The site is not considered to be a suitable settlement limit extension and is therefore rejected and categorised as UNREASONABLE.

**Preferred Site:** No

**Reasonable Alternative:** No

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 29/04/2022

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

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5035
Site address	Land north of Mardle Road, Toft Monks
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	6.1
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	52 dwellings With village green to the south and playing pitches to the north
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>An access onto A143 is unlikely to be supported. The possibility of creating a suitable access onto Pound Lane or Burnthouse Lane is significantly constrained as these are very narrow rural lanes. An adequate access onto Mardle Road would mean the loss of a green area of mature hedge and trees. An access would require road widening and a site frontage footway.</p> <p>No footway on these three roads linking to A143 and catchment school.</p> <p>In addition, such a large increase in vehicles would increase slowing, stopping and turning movements at both the Mardle Road and Pound Lane/A143 junctions onto the Corridor of Movement.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways:</b> Amber. No direct access to A143, would require access via Pound Lane including right turn lane and pedestrian crossing refuge</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		at A143, Pound Lane would require widening and footway for its entire frontage, likely to result in tree / hedge removals.	
<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>	Amber	<p>Distance to bus service 170 metres</p> <p>Distance to Glebelands Primary School 1.3km with footway along A143 but intimidating route given nature of road. No footpath on Pound Lane.</p>	N/A
<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>	N/A	<p>No village or community hall within 1.8km</p> <p>Distance to White Lion public house 230 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity		<p>No known capacity constraints</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter indicates these are available.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Agricultural land with no buildings, unlikely to be contaminated. No issues evident.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p><b>Minerals &amp; Waste:</b> Safeguarding area (sand and gravel). Site over 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1 with some small areas at risk of surface water flooding around the perimeters, along the central east-west field boundary and to the south around the pond. Mitigation possible.</p> <p><b>LLFA:</b> Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>On-site flood risk is mostly concentrated to the site boundary, with some areas of localised ponding.</p> <p>The site is in proximity of one known record of anecdotal/external flooding on St Benedicts Close. We advise this is considered in the site assessment.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>  Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland  Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development on this scale would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape in this location. This site naturally divides into distinct areas; the northern open field along Pound Lane and the southern area fronting Burnthouse Lane/Mardle Road. Of these the northern field would extend the built-up area into the wider countryside with a severe impact on public views approaching the village from the north. The area fronting Burnthouse Lane is more contained with a lesser impact.	Red
Townscape	Amber	Residential development on this scale would be completely out of character with the small village and sporadic outlying dwellings and farms. Only a much smaller area could be designed to reflect the existing pattern of development – either linear or as a small cul-de-sac – and would need to be close to the existing village pond where development is concentrated.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations. Large site with a variety of habitats. Various mature trees and woodland also hedges and a pond. Would require further investigation.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. Any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m<sup>3</sup>/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream requires consultation with NE. Residential dwellings not identified as requiring NE consultation. Amber zone for great crested newts. Not on GI corridor and no PROW onsite.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Listed church to west, listed hall to east. No direct impact on heritage assets but parts of the proposal would have a significant impact on the wider setting of the listed church.</p> <p>Archaeology would require further investigation due to finds on west side of Burnthouse Lane.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss – proposed public open space would mean a net increase.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>The surrounding highways network is considered to be substandard, including the junction with the A143.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – No direct access to A143, would require access via Pound Lane including right turn lane and pedestrian crossing refuge at A143, Pound Lane would require widening and footway for its entire frontage, likely to result in tree / hedge removals.</p> <p>Due to no specific scoring provided by NCC Highways site is scored Amber but there are significant local</p>	Amber



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		concerns.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agricultural and residential, large agricultural storage building to north. Woodland and a pond.	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No immediate impact on heritage assets although some parts would be in views from the listed church and would impact on its wider setting.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Appears difficult to achieve and would need to focus on a smaller site area which requires the Highway Authority to assess suitability. The roads are very rural in nature, to the north and west they are single track with few passing places and the junctions are difficult to navigate. Turning onto the A143 can be difficult because of road speeds.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, 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 and residential. Large agricultural storage building to north – use would need consideration if residential proposed adjacent. Woodland and a pond.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Various, largely field boundaries with hedges and trees.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Woodland and a pond present.	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)	Secondary Distribution Cable over 230/400V and up to 11KV crossing the site.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Southern part of site is more contained with woodland backdrop, views out limited although can see the church from various vantage points. Views in and out of northern area are wider as the landscape is more open and flatter.	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)	Residential development of the whole area, or on the scale proposed would be out of character with the village and have an impact on the landscape. Concerns about the suitability of the surrounding roads and the impact on the A143. Access to local services by foot is limited due to nature of network with impacts in terms of the number of journeys made by car.	Red

## 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 – two owners.	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)	Supporting details relating to services. No details relating to the deliverability of proposed open space etc.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes, road widening and footpath.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Village green/open space and playing pitches.	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

**Suitability:** The Highway Authority have not specifically scored the site in respect of the suitability of the surrounding highway network to accommodate further development. However, a number of issues are raised including the need for road widening, a right turn land and pedestrian refuge at the A146.

Whilst there are an acceptable range of services and facilities within an appropriate distance of the site, consistent with the assessment criteria, the quality of access to these facilities is diminished by the absence of localised footpath links and the route to the school being along the busy A146.

Significant concerns about the detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area both in respect of the relationship of the site to the existing built form of Toft Monks and more widely on the landscape due to the distance between the site and the built-up area of the village.

From a biodiversity perspective, Ecology advice has indicated that any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m<sup>3</sup>/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream requires consultation with NE. Noted that site was within an Amber zone for great crested newts.

**Site Visit Observations:** Residential development of the whole area, or on the scale proposed would be out of character with the village and have an impact on the landscape. Concerns about the suitability of the surrounding roads and the impact on the A143. There is limited access to services by foot and the majority of journeys would be by car.

**Local Plan Designations:** None

**Availability:** Site is in private ownership and is available immediately.

**Achievability:** A number of Highway alterations are identified as being necessary across the local network to address concerns about its suitability. It is unclear that these could be viably achieved or without unacceptable levels of harm to the character of the area or more widely within available landownerships.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** Concerns about the suitability of the local network to accommodate the development proposed. There are concerns about the potential to create a suitable access onto smaller adjacent road, or in certain on Mardle without loss of tree and hedgerow important to the character of the area. Residential development on the scale proposed in this location would have a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area in terms of landscape and its relationship to the existing village. SN5037, which is closer to the village, has been promoted as a smaller element of this site and has been assessed separately. There are a limited but acceptable range of local services and facilities within an appropriate distance of the site. However, the quality of access is diminished by the absence of footpaths along the whole route and by the nature of the route to primary school which goes along the busy A146. On balance the site is not considered suitable for development and is therefore an UNREASONABLE alternative for allocation.

**Preferred Site: No**

**Reasonable Alternative: No**

**Rejected: Yes**

Date Completed: 29/04/2022

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

**Part 1 - Site Details**

<b>Detail</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	SN5036
<b>Site address</b>	Land west of Burnthouse Lane, Toft Monks
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	None
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	1.18
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension</b>	Allocated site
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	Not specified 29 at 25dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

**Part 2 - Absolute Constraints**

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

<b>Is the site located in, or does the site include:</b>	<b>Response</b>
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>The possibility of creating a suitable access onto Burnthouse Lane is significantly constrained as this is a narrow rural lane. An access would require road widening and possibly a site frontage footway.</p> <p>No footway on the three roads linking to A143 and catchment school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Green. Network not of suitable standard, no footway to school / local facilities.</p> <p>Whilst NCC highways have not raised a direct concern over direct access being formed to the site potential for localised road widening means that the Council has rated this Amber.</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>	Amber	<p>Distance to bus service 350 metres</p> <p>Distance to Glebelands Primary School 1.4km with footway along A143 but intimidating route given nature of road. No footpath on Burnthouse Lane/Pound Lane/Mardle Road.</p>	N/A
<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>	N/A	<p>No village or community hall within 1.8km</p> <p>Distance to White Lion public house 280 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity		<p>No known utilities constraints</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter indicates these are available.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Agricultural land with no buildings, unlikely to be contaminated. No issues evident.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1 with a very small area along the northern boundary at medium risk of surface water flooding. This could be mitigated.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p><b>LLFA:</b> Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>On-site flood risk is very minor on the northern site boundary.</p> <p>The site is on proximity of one known record of anecdotal/external flooding on St Benedicts Close. We advise this is considered in the site assessment.</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>  Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland  Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site fronts Burnthouse Lane between some limited development however it is very rural in character and does encroach into the wider landscape towards the church.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Residential development of the whole site would be out of character with the small village and sporadic outlying dwellings and farms. A	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		smaller frontage area could reflect the existing linear pattern of development in the village.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations. There is limited habitat with some nearby mature trees, woodland and a pond. Would require further investigation.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. SSSI IRZ - Any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 5m<sup>3</sup>/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream requires consultation with Natural England. Amber zone for great crested newts - ponds within 250m radius. not on GI corridor and no priority habitat onsite (MAGIC). PROW Toft Monks FP10 passes through site.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Some impact on setting of heritage assets as it would be in views of the listed church. Well used footpath link to the church crosses the site. Site of Archaeological Interest to the west – would also require investigation.</p> <p><b>HES</b> – Amber. Partially within area of earthworks. Will require investigation to determine if would be affected of if either ‘preservation by record’ or a change to the development layout enabling ‘preservation in situ’ would be most appropriate.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>The surrounding highways network is considered to be substandard, including the junction with the A143.</p> <p>FP10 crosses the site diagonally.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Network not of</p>	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		suitable standard, no footway to school / local facilities.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No immediate impact on heritage assets although it would be in views from and to the listed church which would need to be assessed.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Has a road frontage and access may be possible if visibility is achievable. However, the surrounding roads are narrow with few passing places and poor visibility.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, 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 and residential.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries not delineated, open to west and east. Some trees to north and south.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some trees. Land is cropped as part of the wider field.	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)	Secondary Distribution Cable over 230/400V and up to 11KV to south of the site.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is not contained as it is part of a larger field. Site is open in views across the landscape, it would be in views from and to the listed church.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	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>Residential development on the scale proposed would be out of scale with the village but linear development would reflect the village. Would need to assess the visual impact on the setting of the church, the suitability of the surrounding roads and the impact on the A143.</p> <p>Access to local services by foot is limited due to nature of network with impacts in terms of the number of journeys made by car.</p> <p>A footpath crosses the site diagonally which would reduce the developable area significantly.</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)	Supporting details relating to services.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes, road widening and footpath.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A



## Part 7 - Conclusion

**Suitability:** NCC highways have set out their view that the local network not of suitable standard and raised concerns about the lack of a continuous footway to school / local facilities. Officer concerns about ability to create a suitable direct access given nature of local highway.

Site is in a location that is very rural in character development would encroach into the wider landscape towards the church. Residential development of the whole site would be out of character with the small village and sporadic outlying dwellings and farms.

Ecology advice has identified that any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 5m<sup>3</sup>/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream requires consultation with Natural England. Site is in an Amber zone for great crested newts - ponds within 250m radius. PROW Toft Monks FP10 passes through site.

Historic Environment Service advice identifies that site is partially within area of earthworks. This will require investigation to determine if site is affected, and if so whether either 'preservation by record' or a change to the development layout enabling 'preservation in situ' would be most appropriate.

**Site Visit Observations:** Residential development on the scale proposed would be out of scale with the village but linear development would more closely reflect the village. Would need to assess the visual impact on the setting of the church given the open, unbounded nature of the field. Narrow rural roads would need to consider suitability and also the impact on the A143. A footpath crosses the site diagonally which would reduce the developable area significantly.

**Local Plan Designations:** None

**Availability:** Site is in private ownership and is available immediately.

**Achievability:** Road widening is likely to be necessary across the local network to address concerns about its suitability and it is unclear that these could be viably achieved and without unacceptable levels of harm to the character of the area or more widely within available landownerships.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** Significant concerns about the suitability of the local network to accommodate the development proposed and there are concerns about the potential to create a suitable access given the nature of the local roads. The field is unbounded and has views across to the local church which raises both heritage and landscape impact concerns. Residential development on the scale proposed would be out of scale with the village. A smaller linear development to the village could help to address this but this may not be of a scale suitable for allocation as is unlikely to address other concerns. The footpath that cross the site is likely to reduce the developable area and may result in an awkward layout if the site were developed.

There are a limited but acceptable range of local services and facilities within an appropriate distance of the site. However, the quality of access is diminished by the absence of footpaths along the whole route and by the nature of the route to primary school which goes along the busy A146. On balance the site is not considered suitable for development and is therefore an UNREASONABLE alternative for allocation.

**Preferred Site:** No

**Reasonable Alternative:** No

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 29/04/2022

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

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5037
Site address	Land at Mardle Road and Burnthouse Lane, Toft Monks
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	1987/2103/O for 4 dwellings refused 09/09/1987. 1981/1365/O for 3 dwellings refused 13/05/1981. 1977/3241/O for 26 dwellings refused, appeal dismissed 27/02/79. 1974/0971/D for 26 dwellings approved but not built.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.7
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 30 dwellings and a village green/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

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	<p>The possibility of creating a suitable access onto Burnthouse Lane is significantly constrained as this is a narrow rural lane. An adequate access onto Mardle Road would mean the loss of a green area of mature hedge and trees. Either access would require road widening and a site frontage footway.</p> <p>No footway on roads linking to A143 and catchment school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Highway have scored the site "Green" for access, indicating that they believe that access by all means is possible. However, they have also set out that the surrounding network is not of suitable standard, no footway to school / local facilities.</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>	Amber	<p>Distance to bus service 150 metres</p> <p>Distance to Glebelands Primary School 1.4km with footway along A143 but intimidating route given nature of road. No footpath on Burnthouse Lane/Mardle Road.</p>	N/A
<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>	N/A	<p>No village or community hall within 1.8km</p> <p>Distance to White Lion public house 80 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	<p>No known utilities constraints.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green (Foul Water Capacity)</p>	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter indicates these are available but this would need to be confirmed.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Agricultural land with no buildings, unlikely to be contaminated. No issues evident.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1 with some small areas at risk of surface water flooding around the perimeters, along the central east-west field boundary and	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>to the south around the pond. Mitigation possible.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>On-site flood risk is mostly concentrated to the site boundary and a pond feature near the south site boundary.</p> <p>The site is on proximity of one known record of anecdotal/external flooding on St Benedicts Close. We advise this is considered in the site assessment.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green (Flood Risk)</p>	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>  Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland  Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The area fronting Burnthouse Lane is relatively well contained with woodland to the south and east. It is very rural in character, but it does not encroach into the wider	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		landscape.	
Townscape	Amber	Residential development on this scale would be out of character with the small village and sporadic outlying dwellings and farms. A smaller area could be designed to reflect the existing pattern of development – either linear or as a small cul-de-sac – and would need to be close to the existing village pond where development is concentrated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No designations. There is a variety of habitats; mature trees and woodland also hedges and a pond. Would require further investigation.  <b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. SSSI IRZ- Residential development of 50 units or more/Any residential development of 50 or more houses outside existing settlements/urban areas/Any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m <sup>3</sup> /day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream will require Natural England consultation. Amber risk zone for great crested newts - ponds within 250m and no priority habitat onsite. Not in GI corridor.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No visual impact on heritage assets. Would be seen to a limited extent in views from the listed church. Archaeology would require further investigation due to finds on west side of the road.  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss – proposed public open space would mean a net increase.	Green



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>The surrounding highways network is considered to be substandard, including the junction with the A143.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Network not of suitable standard, no footway to school / local facilities.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential. Woodland and a pond.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No immediate impact on heritage assets although the frontage along Burnthouse Lane would be in views from the listed church.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Has two road frontages, Mardle Lane would likely result in the loss of hedging and trees, Burnthouse Lane may be possible if visibility is achievable.  Roads are narrow with few passing places.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, 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 and residential. Woodland and a pond.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Various, largely field boundaries with hedges and trees.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Woodland and a pond present.	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)	Secondary Distribution Cable over 230/400V and up to 11KV crossing the site.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is relatively contained with woodland backdrop, views out limited although can see the church.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	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>Residential development on the scale proposed would be out of scale with the village but the site could be reduced to a smaller part closest to the village. Concerns about the suitability of the surrounding roads and the impact on the A143. Access to local services by foot is limited due to nature of network with impacts in terms of the number of journeys made by car.</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)
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)	Supporting details relating to services.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes, road widening and footpath.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Village green/open space.	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

**Suitability:** The Highway Authority have raised specific concerns about the suitability of the surrounding highway network to accommodate further development. Whilst there are an acceptable range of services and facilities within an appropriate distance of the site, consistent with the assessment criteria, the quality of access to these facilities is diminished by the absence of localised footpath links and the route to the school being along the busy A146.

In respect of biodiversity technical consultees have noted that any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m<sup>3</sup>/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream will require Natural England consultation. Also the site is in an amber risk zone for great crested newts.

**Site Visit Observations:** There are concerns about whether a suitable access could be created to the site without significant detrimental impacts on local character as a result of the removal of trees and other vegetation.

In respect of the form and character of the settlement any development would need to be of a more limited in scale than is proposed and located in close proximity to the existing built-up area of the village. It is questionable whether a development of sufficient scale to be allocatable could be accommodated on this site within its form and character constraints.

**Local Plan Designations:** None.

**Availability:** Site is in private ownership and is available immediately.

**Achievability:** Road widening is likely to be necessary across the local network to address concerns about its suitability and it is unclear that these could be achieved locally without unacceptable levels of harm to the character of the area or more widely within available landownerships.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** Significant concerns about the suitability of the local network to accommodate the development proposed. Residential development on the scale proposed would be out of scale with the village. A smaller development to the village could address this but this may not be of a scale suitable for allocation. There are concerns about the potential to create a suitable access that without significant loss of trees and hedgerows important to the character of the area. There are a limited but acceptable range of local services and facilities within an appropriate distance of the site. However, the quality of access is diminished by the absence of footpaths along the whole route and by the nature of the route to primary school which goes along the busy A146. On balance the site is not considered suitable for development and is therefore an UNREASONABLE alternative for allocation.

**Preferred Site: No**

**Reasonable Alternative: No**

**Rejected: Yes**

Date Completed: 28 April 2022