

# Wicklewood Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

## Contents

SN4045SL .....	3
SN5018 .....	13

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

**Part 1 - Site Details**

<b>Detail</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	SN4045SL
<b>Site address</b>	Land south of Hackford Road, Wicklewood
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	No relevant planning history
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.49 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension</b>	Settlement limit extension  (An indicative scheme suggests six dwellings)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	12 dwellings at 25dph  12dph at 6 dwellings
<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 would be from Hackford Road on inside of bend</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Subject to satisfactory access and provision of 2.0m wide continuous footway at south side of Hackford Rd and to school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways meeting</b> – Ok subject to footway to the school. Would need a safe crossing point to access the facilities and services on the opposite side of the road NCC TO CHECK LEVEL OF CROSSING REQUIRED (e.g., dropped kerb/ zebra crossing); due to the road configuration it is unlikely that speeding is a particular issue along this stretch of road (as noted in the consultation responses) however there may be a perception of speed when walking alongside the road.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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>	Green	Adjacent to Wicklewood Primary School  Distance to bus service 500 metres  Local employment 800 metres away	
<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 Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 800 metres  Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 500 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Confirmation needed that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	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	Green	No identified flood risk  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required.	Green

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	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		E3 Hingham – Mattishall Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is contained within existing development in the settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land.  <b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER</b> - There is a 'good' hedgerow along the site frontage which would need to be assessed against Policy DM4.8. Views of the Church across this site would also need to be considered	Amber
Townscape	Green	Site is contained within the existing pattern of development.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity  <b>NCC ECOLOGY</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade I listed church and Grade II listed war memorial to north-west of site  <b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE &amp; DESIGN OFFICER</b> – Amber. Grade I listed church to north and war memorial. This would be within wider setting. However there is some existing landscaping affecting intervisibility. The main views of the church tower appear to be to the west across the landscape to the west. There are some views of the tower approaching from the south along Hackford Road and these would need to be taken into account in setting out layout etc.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<b>HES</b> – Amber	
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Hackford Road has reasonable capacity and footway  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Subject to satisfactory access and provision of 2.0m wide continuous footway at south side of Hackford Rd and to school. <i>(HIGHWAYS MEETING - OK, subject to a footway to the school)</i>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	School and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Potential impact on church, however this should be relatively limited by existing residential development on the northern side of Hackford Road – Senior Heritage and Design Officer to comment. Otherwise relatively well contained within existing form and character of settlement.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable onto Hackford Road but NCC Highways comments will be needed	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural 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 to west and on opposite side of Hackford Road to north. School playing field to south. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Some trees to northern boundary, hedge along highway boundary. Wire fence with school playing field	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some potential habitat in trees and hedging	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 line runs east-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	Views across site from Hackford 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>Site is relatively contained and could be developed in keeping with form and character of settlement and therefore is considered acceptable for a settlement limit extension.</p>	<p>Amber</p>

## Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

**Part 6 - Availability and Achievability**

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	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	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## **Part 7 - Conclusion**

### **Suitability**

Site is suitable for a settlement limit extension. The site relates well to the existing settlement and a small development would be compatible with the existing form of development. The site is within proximity of the Listed Church however it is contained within wider views and with careful design would not have a significant impact on the setting of the Church. Access to the site should be achievable however this may result in the loss of part/ all of the frontage hedgerow.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is well contained within the existing settlement. Access would be on inside of bend so access arrangements would need view of highways. Potential for some additional land to north to be included which could allow for allocation but potential heritage issues with church.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting LP designations

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be a reasonable extension to the existing settlement limit. The site relates well to the existing form of development and could accommodate a small allocation. Highways access to the site is likely to be acceptable although it may result in the loss of the frontage hedgerow. The site is within the setting of a listed building but due to the existing pattern of development is relatively well contained and with appropriate mitigation measures would not have a significant impact on the setting of the Church. Mitigation could include design measures to the north of the site to retain views of the Church from Hackford Road.

### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 12 November 2020

Officer: Kate Fisher

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

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5018
Site address	Land rear Birchwood, High Oak Road, Wicklewood
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Various householder applications for adjacent High Oaks. Conversion of outbuildings to 5 holiday units.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.55
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 4 dwellings  (13 dwellings at 25 dph)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

#### SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Existing access from High Oak Road to Birchwood, would need to have adequate visibility.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Not clear acceptable access can be achieved without 3rd party land. Network constrained with no footway to school and local facilities.	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 Wicklewood Primary School 1.8km, without footway and along rural roads (except for 150m on Hackford Rd). Morley Primary School 2.3km.  Distance to bus service 1.85km  Limited local employment within 1km	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Distance to Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 2.15km  Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 1.9km. The Buck, Morley 1.3km.	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utilities capacity to be confirmed  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green (Foul Water Capacity)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter indicates, Private treatment - mains electricity but this would need to be confirmed	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	Amber	Contaminated land as former industrial site – would need investigation if the site progresses further.	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1. No identified surface water flood risk.  <b>LLFA – Green.</b> Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green (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	Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	E3 – Hingham Plateau Farmland  Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is well contained within the curtilage of the existing property and does not encroach into the wider landscape.	Green
Townscape	Amber	The site is distant from the main concentrations of both Wicklewood and Morley and is an outlying area around a previous utility/commercial use. Although it is land associated with an existing property it does not relate well to the villages and is remote from services.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Garden area with some native trees around – some potential limited for habitats which could be mitigated.  <b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. SSSI IRZ but housing and water discharge do not require NE consultation. No priority habitats, No PROW. Not on GI corridor. Amber risk zone for great crested newts. Ponds within 250m.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets.	Amber



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		HES – Amber. Site of brick kiln.	
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Restricted local network of rural roads with no footpaths.  NCC Highways – Red. Not clear acceptable access can be achieved without 3rd party land. Network constrained with no footway to school and local facilities.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Large residential properties, agriculture. Compatible.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	None.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	There is a concreted access which serves the house and the holiday units behind. The hedge at the front and trees to the side are conifers and could be removed for visibility if required.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Garden/ amenity land associated with the existing house.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential, holiday and agriculture. Care would be needed with regard to the relationship between holiday 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)	Some conifer, some deciduous hedges, well delineated.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some mature trees around perimeter.	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)	Previous works area means a contamination investigation would be required.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Very limited as the site is contained.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	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 does not encroach into the landscape and is well contained however it is remote from the school and other services and the surrounding roads are very constrained with no footpaths. This is not a sustainable location and the majority of trips will therefore be 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?	Promoter states that the site is owned by a developer.	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)  Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Immediately	Green
Comments:		N/A

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unknown	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Has 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** The site has been promoted for 4 dwellings but is circa 0.55 hectares in size. The site is therefore of suitable size for allocation however whilst increasing the number of dwellings on the site may result in a more efficient use of land (as required by the NPPF) increased density on this site would not be compatible with the existing pattern of development in this location, including the recent developments at The Oaks and Wicklewood Rise which are low density developments on a former brownfield site. There is no existing settlement limit in proximity of the site and there are no plans to designate a settlement limit in this location. Highways constraints have been identified by the Highways Authority, including poor connectivity to the existing facilities and services. Development of the site would not have a significant landscape impact as it is contained by existing development. A contamination survey would be required due to the past use of the site.

**Site Visit Observations** The site is remote from services and facilities. Recent residential development to the west of the site. High Oak Road is of narrow width and existing trees would likely need removal to create an appropriate visibility splay. Clear views towards the site due to the open landscape however site would be within existing cluster of residential buildings therefore limited visual impact.

**Local Plan Designations** None

**Availability** The site is considered to be available

**Achievability** The site is considered to be achievable

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** SN5018 is considered to be an UNREASONABLE site, both for allocation and as a settlement limit extension. There are currently no plans to designate a settlement limit in this location and an allocation-scale development in this location would be incompatible with the existing built form. The site is contained within the landscape but is poorly connected to the existing services and facilities, both by the existing local road network and pedestrian footways.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 4 May 2022