

Alpington, Yelverton & Bergh Apton
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

Contents

SN5038	3
SN5002	13
SN0400	23
SN0412	35
SN0433	45

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5038
Site address	Land adjacent to Greenway, White Heath Road, Bergh Apton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2018/0556/F for garage and holiday let approved 27/04/2018. Later changes to plans through 2018/1140 and 2020/1116.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted as 1 for current owner (15 if assume 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	Amber	Has road frontage for access. Would need to check if adequate visibility splays achievable. NCC Highways – Red. Insufficient frontage to form safe/satisfactory access. No walking route to local facilities/school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	Thurton Primary school; 1,300m Bus stop on A146; 1,300m Narrow road and no footpath.	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"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	<p>Village hall; 1,500m Pub; 1,200m Nursery; 1,300m Recreation; 1,500m</p> <p>Closest facilities are in Thurton which are only accessible along a narrow unlit rural road with no footpath.</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	<p>No known constraints</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Unknown.	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	<p>No known issues.</p> <p>NCC Minerals & Waste - 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	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1. Surface water flooding 1:100 along footpath to west, 1:1000 to north east.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Standard information required at planning stage. On-site flooding is very minor risk.	

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>)	N/A	B5 Chet Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; 2 Very good (Light Blue)	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Hedging has been cultivated to surround the two isolated properties but it is not characteristic of the surroundings. The landscape is very flat and open with large fields and limited field boundaries. Any new development would have a significant impact on the character of the area.	Red
Townscape	Green	Outside development boundary in open countryside, therefore would have no impact on any townscape.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Used as garden, limited natural habitat. Environment Agency: Green NCC Ecologist: Green. SSSI IRZ but housing not listed - discharge of more than 5m ³ /day to ground requires Natural England consultation. Close to Bergh Apton RB8 (possible link up too?). Green risk zone for great crested newts (no ponds within 250m radius of boundary). Not in Green Infrastructure Corridor.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	No listed buildings nearby. HES – Amber. Adj to cropmarks of Bronze Age burial mounds.	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	White Heath Road is narrow with few passing places. It connects to the A146. NCC Highways – Red. Insufficient frontage to form safe/satisfactory access. No walking route to local facilities/school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Owner's detached bungalow to east. One other property beyond. Paddock to west & open countryside surrounding this.	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?	Access is proposed adjacent to the existing domestic access, further to the south-west. This is a narrow rural road with no footpath or lighting, and it appears that visibility would be limited as it would be on the outside of a bend.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential curtilage.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and open field which would be compatible uses.	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 and sides with fencing to rear.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Native hedging on boundaries, otherwise grassed with no trees within the site. No evidence of adverse ecological impact.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is proposed for one dwelling only which would have a limited impact on the views but if the higher density sought was implemented this would have a significant detrimental impact on the open nature of the area.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Initial site visit conclusion (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>Although Thurton has some services the site is relatively isolated as the road is very narrow and unlit with no footpaths and so walking would be hazardous and it is likely that road speeds would be high. It is not considered a sustainable location for any new development.</p> <p>In addition, any new development would change the character of the area and be remote from the existing settlements.</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
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	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	Within 5 years	Amber
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Possible highway improvements.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No – indicated that this would be a single dwelling for their own occupancy.	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is promoted for a single dwelling but extends to 0.6ha; the site frontage is not sufficient to create an access for a more extensive development. The development is not well related to any of the existing settlements in the vicinity and access to services would be to those facilities located in Thurton, rather the Bergh Apton. Access to Thurton would be via narrow, unlit roads, at the national speed limit, with no footways.

Site Visit Observations

Although Thurton has some services the site is relatively isolated as the road is very narrow and unlit with no footpaths and so walking would be hazardous and it is likely that road speeds would be high. It is not considered a sustainable location for any new development.

In addition, any new development would change the character of the area and be remote from the existing settlements.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability

The site promoter indicates the site is available.

Achievability

The site promoter indicates the site is deliverable, however no additional evidence has been submitted to support this

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site has been promoted for a single dwelling but is of a suitable size for allocation. The site is remote from any of the settlements in the vicinity and would effectively create an isolated dwelling (or small group of dwellings) in the countryside, with consequent impacts on the character of the locality. The closest facilities are in Thurton, which is accessed via narrow, unlit roads at the national speed limit, with no footways.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5002
Site address	Land west of Fortune Green, Alington
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary, adjacent to south. Very small area to south in development boundary.
Planning History	None Adj to north- west: 2021/1512 Agricultural building approved.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	15 at 25 dph. Likely to be fewer if bungalows
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	To south-west corner from road is a gated access on the frontage. Looks very narrow from plan, are adequate visibility splays achievable? May require removal of hedge; await HA consult. NCC Highways – Red. Insufficient frontage to form safe/satisfactory access. No walking route to local facilities/ school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Primary School; 800m Aldis & Son Farm Shop with post office; 1,200m Various small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity.	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"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	<p>Village Hall Recreation Ground; 1,100m Pub; 400m. Café at farm shop; 1,200m Pre-school (Cottontails) at village hall; 1,100m Yelverton Football Club; 1,300m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity		<p>Promoter states there are no known constraints relating to utilities.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Main sewer in road, other services available. Promoter states there are no known constraints relating to utilities infrastructure.	Green
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	Greenfield site. Promoter there have been no historical works undertaken on the site that would have resulted in any known ground stability issues or contamination.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood Zone 1 No surface water flooding on site. SWFD 1-1000 along PRow on west boundary which is at a lower level.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. Flood risk is very minor localised flooding to the site boundary.</p>	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 Settled Plateau (top north-west corner)	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	B5 Chet Tributary Farmland D2 Poringland Settled Plateau Farmland (top north-west corner) Agricultural Land Classification; possibly Grade 2 Very good (Light Blue)	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is flat and set back from the road frontage behind existing development. Only the access would be visible from the road frontage if bungalows were built. It is contained and does not encroach into open countryside. It is not clear whether the land is Grade 2, however it is not part of a larger agricultural field and appears that it has never been in productive use. It is currently overgrown scrubland.	Green
Townscape	Green	It is adjacent to existing residential development which comprises detached bungalows/chalet bungalows on good sized plots. Would need to be bungalows to reflect this. It would not be out of character.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No designations. Mature trees on boundaries. Promoter confirms a comprehensive ecological appraisal would be submitted and mitigation could be provided. The access could impact on hedging/trees to west of site, although already other accesses along this part of the road and the hedge to the west is of poor quality.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>Environment Agency: Green</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Amber. Amber zone for great crested newts. Pond within 250m of boundary. SSSI IRZ but housing not listed- discharge of water to ground of more than 20m³ requires Natural England consultation. No priority habitats. Not in Green Infrastructure Corridor.</p> <p>Adjacent to Alpington FP11. Not clear how site would be accessed.</p>	
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No assets affected. Nearest listed building is over 450m away.</p> <p>HES – Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Wheel Road is narrow with no footpath.</p> <p>PRoW along west boundary, outside of site, accessible from the site.</p> <p>Assuming a suitable access can be achieved, the site links to the current network serving the village, which links to the A146 and Poringland.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Insufficient frontage to form safe/satisfactory access. No walking route to local facilities/ school.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Field to north. Residential to east and south.</p> <p>Fortune Paddock - agricultural livestock to north-west, a game farm rearing birds, with associated grassed area and menage to west of proposed access, all separated by the footpath which is enclosed by hedges/trees.</p>	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 07/02/22	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?	The access is from the road frontage but it is narrow and need the Highway Authority to check if visibility is adequate, particularly to the west. Also the route in, adjacent to Wheelview, looks too narrow to accommodate an adequate access.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Undeveloped, overgrown grassland. Quite saturated when walking over it.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	The proposed access to the west boundary could have a negative impact on residential amenity of the existing bungalow. Game farm with stabling/paddock buildings. Appears compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level and flat.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees, hedging, residential dwellings to east and south.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedges/trees on boundaries, pond to west of access.	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)	The site is undeveloped and no evidence of any previous use, suggests contamination is unlikely.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited by mature vegetation and footpath, rear residential gardens.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 07/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Initial site visit conclusion (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 contained within the form of the village and does not encroach into the landscape. A development could be achieved which is sensitive to the existing properties.</p> <p>The main concern from the site visit is that the access is inadequate both at the frontage and the width into the site.</p>	Amber

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)
Small part in development boundary		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Site is under option to a developer.	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 and developer is ready to start.	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Promoter states have confirmed deliverability of site in supporting document. Also, that there is an option agreement between the landowners and developer, and the developer works efficiently to deliver sites.	Green
Are on-site/off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Standard access improvements.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated affordable housing will be provided in line with Policy. Promoter states have confirmed deliverability of affordable housing in supporting document and the developer will deliver it.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Broadly the site has few constraints, is visually contained and is well located in terms of distance to services. However, the site does not have sufficient frontage to create a suitable access and the access way is narrow and passes in very close proximity to the existing dwelling. Wheel Lane has limited footways and the site does not offer the opportunity to improve them

Site Visit Observations

The site is contained within the form of the village and does not encroach into the landscape. A development could be achieved which is sensitive to the existing properties.

The main concern from the site visit is that the access is inadequate both at the frontage and the width into the site.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability

The promoter has indicated that the site is under option to a developer.

Achievability

The site promoter indicates the site is deliverable, however no additional evidence has been submitted to support this.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is well contained within the landscape, is within a reasonable distance of facilities and has few constraints. However, the site frontage is not sufficient to create a suitable access and Wheel Road has limited footways and the site does not offer the opportunity to improve the situation.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0400
Site address	Land at Church Meadow, Alington
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	2014/2460 - 21 dwellings EIA not required. 2014/2608 - 21 dwellings, refused. Reasonable alternative at last Local Plan.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.87ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocated site for up to 22 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted at 11.8/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

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>Access from Church Meadow, which appears to be the same width as the existing road and footways.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber, footway access to school, good standard junction at Church Meadow/Church Road. Carriageway widening to 5.5m required in vicinity of junction with Church Road.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting - Church Meadow access is sufficient/ satisfactory. Existing footway to the school with a good junction at Church Road. Public comments refer to need for widening of Church Road and additional crossing point. As development is of a similar scale to that previously proposed these details are required; key issue would be road widening on Church Road by the Church Meadow junction; potentially formalize existing unmarked bus stops; crossing point to the village hall, but this would not need to be a substantial.</p>	Green

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"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Primary School - 500m</p> <p>Bus stop on X2 route (Slade Rd) - 1,600m</p> <p>Aldis & Sons Farm Shop - 1,800m</p> <p>Variety of small-scale local employment in the vicinity.</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Village Hall with Recreation Ground - 250m</p> <p>Yelverton Football Club & Pavilion - 550m</p> <p>Pub - 800m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific know constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified on/close to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for NR14 7NY area.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>Greenfield site with no known issues.</p> <p>SNC Env Services – Green.</p> <p>Land Quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No potentially contaminated sites are located within 500m of the site in question on the PCLR or Landmark databases other than a former agricultural repair workshop (about 450m from the site in question) and a 	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		graveyard. Neither of these are considered significant. - Nothing of concern with regard to land quality noted on the historic OS maps. - Having regard to the size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application.	
Flood Risk	Green	1:1000 year surface water flooding in the centre/southern end of the site. LLFA - Few or no constraints.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Part Tributary Farmland Part Settled Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Majority of site is Settled Plateau Farmland, with small area to the south in Tributary Farmland.	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	No designated landscapes, but veteran tree in the northeast corner. Well contained site, with mature trees and hedging to the north and west. Grade 3 Agricultural Land. SNC Landscape Meeting – Acceptable, visually contained site, no landscape objections to previous application 2014/2608. Any development would need to improve situation for veteran tree, and retain boundary vegetation.	Green
Townscape	Green	Well contained site with modern (late C20) housing development to the south and east.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		SNC Heritage & Design – Green	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designated sites within close proximity. However some mature hedgerow/tress on the boundary, which are likely to require protection.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	St Mary’s Church, Yelverton to the north east of the site, although existing houses and sports pavilion are between the church and this site. No obvious inter-visibility. SNC Heritage & Design – Green, no real impact on setting of church because of existing development to the east. HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space, although there would appear to be informal paths across the north west of the site.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Requires access through existing residential development, but otherwise links to the current network serving the village, which links to the A146 and Poringland. NCC Highways – Green, footway access to school, good standard junction at Church Meadow/Church Road. Carriageway widening to 5.5m required in vicinity of junction with Church Road. NCC Highways Meeting - Church Meadow access is sufficient/ satisfactory. Existing footway to the school with a good junction at Church Road.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Medium/low density housing to the south and east. Sports field to the north. Agricultural to the west. SNC Env Services – Green. Amenity:	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		- No issues observed.	

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Well contained site, which could be developed at a similar density to the adjoining Church Meadow development.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Road width access from Church Meadow	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield, although parts of the field appear to have been fenced off for domestic use and to keep horses/ponies.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to the south and east, football club to the north, agricultural to the west. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature hedgerows with trees to the north and west, domestic boundaries to the south and east.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some mature trees within the hedgerows on the boundary/just outside of the site. Veteran in the north east corner.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Greenfield, therefore unlikely to be contaminated.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Public views are limited, principally from the main access point.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Initial site visit conclusion (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>Well contained site, with limited features within the site itself, but mature hedgerows to the north and west boundaries. Would appear suitable for similar scale/density development to the adjoining Church Meadow housing.</p>	<p>Green</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)
Open Countryside		
Conclusion	Adjoining the Development Boundary	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Not currently being market, is being promoted on behalf of Ottley Properties.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	
Comments:	Site was vacant at the time of promotion, but appears to have some domestic use at present.	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Evidence has been supplied, including an updated layout for the site, however much of this dates from the original 2016 submission. Site being promoted on behalf of an established house builder. No known constraints to delivery.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Large site, capable of accommodating open space. It is not envisaged that any off site improvements will be required.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes, at the time of submission in 2016	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Potentially an enhanced level of open space, given the size/shape of the site and the ability to accommodate 25 dwellings.	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

No overriding constraints and site is reasonably located to access local services/facilities with good standards roads and footway links. Greenfield site, adjacent to the existing development boundary.

Site Visit Observations

Well contained site, which could be developed at a similar density to the adjoining development. Protection of the veteran tree and the mature landscaping to the existing boundaries is required.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but adjacent to the existing Development Boundary.

Availability

Promoter states that the site is available, viable and in the ownership of a developer.

Achievability

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable – the site is well located in terms of access to local services/facilities, with footway links to those in the village. The site is visually well contained, with no overriding constraints. Suitable for allocation for up to 25 dwellings, reflecting the scale and density of Church Meadow and the constraints of the site shape. Opportunity to enhance the setting the veteran tree in the north east corner of the site.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 05/11/20

Officer: Kate Fisher

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0412
Site address	Former concrete works, Church Road, Bergh Apton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.7 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocation of 12-25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Brownfield

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>Potential access constraints could be overcome through development</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No safe walking route to school.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting - Reasonable to support a brownfield site with previous associated traffic movements. The site would probably be best developed with a less formal layout/highways infrastructure, emphasising it's rural location. Shouldn't result in higher traffic numbers than previous use of the site (recognising that this will have included a high proportion of HGVs); minimum is road widening and footpath along site frontage but ideally as far as the St/Church Rd</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		junction to the east. However, there may be limitations due to third party land constraints - so an alternative would be to provide passing places ("localised improvements to Church Road"). The policy for this site should be prescriptive to ensure no upwards creep of numbers on site beyond what has been accepted by HA.	
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Alpington & Bergh Apton school is 2.1 km with no footways</p> <p>Farm shop with post office is 2.4km away with no footways</p> <p>Bus service is 300 metres away</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Bergh Apton village hall is 1.1km away with no footways</p> <p>The Wheel of Fortune PH in Alpington is 2.5 km away with no footways until you get the settlement of Alpington</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewerage infrastructure upgrades and off-site mains reinforcement may be required	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	The site promoter has stated that mains water supply and electricity are available on the site. Sewerage is not	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Site is likely to be contaminated to some extent but should be able to be mitigated	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Some identified surface water flood risk on site but can be mitigated LLFA - Few or no constraints.	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	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is currently detrimental to local landscape, but is quite open and visible so new development would need to be sensitively designed with mitigation through landscaping SNC Landscape Meeting - does not appear to be incompatible with LCA, subject to appropriate scheme design. Opportunity to enhance views to the north from the nearby PRow. Existing vegetation does not appear to be historic and is a non-native mix.	Green
Townscape	Green	Adjacent to one dwelling but otherwise removed from the settlement SNC Heritage & Design – Green	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Unlikely to have an adverse impact given existing use on site. Potential for enhancement	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		NCC Ecology – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	
Historic Environment	Green	No identified heritage asset affected by development SNC Heritage & Design – Green HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Narrow country lane may need improvements NCC Highways – Red, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No safe walking route to school. NCC Highways Meeting - Reasonable to support a brownfield site with previous associated traffic movements. The site would probably be best developed with a less formal layout/highways infrastructure, emphasising it's rural location.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site relates poorly to existing settlement but may be some potential to link site to existing cluster of development at junction of corner of The Street and Church Road through development of site SN0203. Alternatively it could be another small standalone cluster of development as is characteristic of the settlement. No adverse impact on historic environment	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Need to consult with highway authority further. Existing access into site but Church Road is rural and narrow and if highway authority seek improvements could result in loss of hedgerows and trees	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Brownfield use with structures on site that will increase development costs. However, benefits from removing these derelict structures	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Mainly agricultural with one dwelling to east so no compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is relatively level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows and some trees on boundary	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some habitat possible in 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)	Some potential for contamination on site	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	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	Views available into site from Church Road. Relatively contained from other directions by planting, although some views possible from Lower Kiln Lane to west	N/A
Initial site visit conclusion (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)	As a brownfield site there benefits from redevelopment of this site. It is separated from the other parts of the settlement along a narrow country lane, although this is common for most parts of Bergh Apton.	

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
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single 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? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately/Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	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)	May be requirement to improvements to Church Road	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified other than removal of derelict brownfield site	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Whilst the site is not ideally located on a narrow country lane, there is a long-standing historic traffic use which can be offset against the traffic from new housing. As well as the removal of existing industrial/storage building on site, the development would be broadly in keeping with the character of Bergh Apton as cluster groups of dwellings, rather than infill the gaps between the clusters. Existing vegetation around the site is relatively recent and non-native.

Site Visit Observations

Brownfield site separated from the other parts of the settlement along a narrow country lane, although this is common for most parts of Bergh Apton.

Local Plan Designations

Outside and removed from development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable – whilst the site is not ideal in terms of highways access, the traffic generated by former uses (and potential lawful uses of the site) can be offset against the traffic from any redevelopment. Consideration needs to be given to the level of highways works that would be appropriate in this rural setting. The site could be seen as compatible with the pattern of small clustered groups of dwellings that make up Bergh Apton, and preferable to further infilling between the clusters. The site itself has few constraints other than the clearance and clean-up costs related to the current buildings, hardstanding etc. Existing vegetation is non-native and redevelopment offers an opportunity to enhance the site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 23/06/2020

Officer: Kate Fisher

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0433
Site address	Land at Wheel Road, Alington NR14 7NL
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	No planning applications post-2000 Reasonable alternative in the last Local Plan
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.0
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocated site. (Promoted for approximately 10 dwellings as a SL extension)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Minimum of 12/ha. (Promoted for 10/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	<p>Long frontage to Wheel Road, with existing field access.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting - From a Highways perspective the entire frontage needs improvement; could widen Wheel Road, however this would require substantial hedge removal. Wheel Road narrows outside the Wheel of Fortune, but this relatively short pinch point should be OK. Reeders Lane junction is substandard – could potentially be widened for improved visibility.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public 	Amber	<p>Primary School - 450m</p> <p>Aldis & Son Farm Shop - 1,175m</p> <p>Various small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity.</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
transport			
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Pub - less than 50m Village Hall with Recreation Ground - 775m Yelverton Football Club & Pavilion - 950m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	33Kv overhead lines at the eastern end of the site, may require diversion/effect the layout of development.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for NR14 7NL area.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Greenfield site with no known issues. SNC Env Services: Green Land Quality: - No potentially contaminated sites are located within 500m of the site in question on the PCLR or Landmark databases other than a former agricultural repair workshop (about 120m from the site in question) and a graveyard. Neither of these are considered significant.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nothing of concern with regard to land quality noted on the historic OS maps. - Having regard to the size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application. 	
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Small area in the east of the site subject to surface water flooding up to 1 in 100 years.</p> <p>LLFA - Few or no constraints.</p>	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>)		Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>No designated landscapes.</p> <p>Substantial hedge to the road frontage, with mature tree at the Wheel Rd/Reeder's Lane junction. However, hedging likely to be lost to create a suitable access. Aspect to the south is more open and visible from south on Reeder's Lane.</p> <p>Grade 3 agricultural land.</p> <p>SNC Landscape Meeting - Significant boundary/roadside hedgerow and vegetation. Does not appear to be compatible with LCA.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Green	Postwar housing on the opposite side of Wheel Road, and Wheel of Fortune pub immediately to the east.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>However this site would extend the settlement into more open countryside south of the village. Potential to screen/integrate the site.</p> <p>SNC Heritage & Design – Amber</p>	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designated sites within close proximity. However some mature hedgerow/tress on the boundary, which are likely to require protection.</p> <p>NCC Ecology – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Red	<p>Potential impact on listed building to the south, Stacey Cottage, which currently has no screening between it and the site.</p> <p>SNC Heritage & Design – Amber, a suitably designed linear development would be fine, if developed to the north along the same line as the FW properties site to the east, this would leave a suitably sized rectangular agricultural field to the south. There is also the Wheel of Fortune to consider as a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space.	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Assuming a suitable access can be achieved the site links to the current network serving the village, which links to the A146 and Poringland.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting - From a Highways perspective the entire frontage needs improvement; could widen Wheel Road, however this would require substantial hedge removal. Wheel Road narrows outside the Wheel of Fortune, but this relatively short pinch point</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		should be OK. Reeders Lane junction is substandard – could potentially be widened for improved visibility.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Pub to the east, road frontage to the north and west, with residential development beyond. Agricultural land to the south.</p> <p>SNC Env Services: Green</p> <p>Amenity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site in question is adjacent to the Wheel of Fortune PH, Wheel Road, Alington, Norfolk, NR14 7NL. Consideration should be given to the potential impact of the Public House on future residents along with the impact on the future viability of the Public House of introducing noise sensitive receptors close to it. 	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Potential impact on the listed Stacey Cottage to the south.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Current field entrance to the site, close to the existing junction with Fortune Green. Substantial hedge, at least part of which may need to be removed. On a bend in Wheel Road and extends to the junction with Reeder's Lane.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, with no obvious concerns.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Pub, residential and open countryside. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Road frontage to Wheel Road and Reeder's Lane, only immediately adjoining development is the pub. Currently no boundary to the south, as the site subdivides a larger field.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Substantial hedgerow, with a ditch, to the Wheel Road frontage, includes tree(s) at the Reeder's Lane junction.	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)	Two sets of overhead powerlines across the site, which may require diversion or accommodating in any development layout.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views of the site from the village are limited by the existing hedge, although any removal to create an access would make the site significantly more open. The site is more open from the south and can	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	be seen through the field entrance on Reeder's Lane.	
<p>Initial site visit conclusion (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>Whilst the site is effectively in gap between the Wheel of Fortune pub and housing on Burgate Lane, with additional housing on the opposite side of Wheel Road, the site has a rural feel, with a substantial hedge and ditch to the Wheel Road frontage and a more open aspect to the south.</p> <p>Careful consideration needs to be given to any access, with the bend in Wheel Road and junctions with Reeder's Lane and Fortune Green, plus the potential need to remove at least part of the frontage hedge.</p>	Amber

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)
Open Countryside		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion		Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Not currently being marketed, but is promoted by a house builder.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	
Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Site promoted by an established house builder who also completed the nearby 2015 allocation on Wheel Road. No known constraints to delivery.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Landowner also controls and to the south, should open space/landscaping etc be required. It is not envisaged that further off-site improvements will be required.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes, at the time of submission in 2016	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is an unconstrained greenfield site, relatively well located in terms of access to local services/facilities. Keeping the development to the northern part of the field would limit the impact on the rural setting of Stace Cottage to the south. However, Wheel Road at the site frontage is narrow and has restricted forward visibility and the carriageway narrows in vicinity of the Wheel of Fortune PH. Whilst this 'pinch point' at the pub might be acceptable, the removal of the substantial frontage hedge (containing some larger trees) would significantly change the character of the area. Need to establish whether the 33Kv power lines are a constraint.

Site Visit Observations

Site quite rural in character, and currently well screened from surrounding development. However that screening is likely to need to be removed to access the site.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but on the opposite side of Wheel Road to the existing Development Boundary.

Availability

Promoter is a local house builder who states that the site is available and viable.

Achievability

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is reasonably located in terms of local services and facilities and has few on-site constraints. The main concerns with the site relate to the removal of the substantial frontage hedge (with trees) to facilitate the necessary highways improvements, across the whole site frontage from the Reeders Lane/Burgate Lane junction (which itself would require improvement) to the Wheel of Fortune. This would significantly change the character of the area and raise concerns in terms of wider landscape character.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 5 November 2020

Officer: Kate Fisher