

Aslacton, Great Moulton & Tibenham
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

Contents

SN0459REVA	3
SN5010	14
SN5048	27

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0459REVA
Site address	Land off Church Road, Aslacton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2019/0460 (15 dwellings approved on land south of Church Road)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.40 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for approx. 33 dwellings with a 1-acre village green, car parking related to the nearby school and possible public building with associated additional parking.
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>Site bounded by Church Road and Muir Lane. Potential access constraints could be overcome through development</p> <p>Highways score (SN0459) – Amber. Adjacent cul-de-sac not adopted so not available for pedestrian link to Church Road. C/w narrow at 3.6m (measured via NMB). Possible land available for f/w but would require removal of what may be a privately owned hedge. C/w could be widened over length of site frontage to allow safe access from east but safe pedestrian access to existing settlement is problematic.</p> <p>Highways Meeting (SN0459)- Subject to carriageway widening of Church Road to 5.5m between the existing layby west of the site to the junction with Muir Lane and at Muir Lane for full extent of site frontage. Provide 2.0m footway for full extent of Church Lane frontage and from Muir Lane junction north to the existing</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		bus stop. Bus stops to be upgraded to comply with DDA requirements.	
<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>120m walk to primary school (no footpath for 60m)</p> <p>Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops immediately adjacent to site on Muir Lane</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>Mobile library</p> <p>Great Moulton Coronation Hall – 950m</p> <p>Fox & Hounds PH – 1,400m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	<p>Wastewater capacity to be confirmed.</p> <p>AW advise sewers crossing the site (south east corner)</p>	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, gas, electricity and foul drainage available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED 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. Identified area of flood risk along Muir Lane to east (adjacent to the site boundary) would need to be taken into consideration LLFA score (GNLP for SN0459)– Green (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	Part Tributary Farmland with Parkland Part Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland B1: Tas Tributary Farmland ALC grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is open in wider views. Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated through design and boundary planting	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated through design reflecting character and density of adjacent development Heritage & Conservation Officer (SN0459) - This could continue linear form of development with housing to west. New development already approved to the south the road. Up to 40 units appears large allocation considering the small size of the village and rural location. The rural location needs to be taken into account in density, landscaping, type of units etc. Note the small public space to the east – this would be good in townscape terms to maintain the rural character of the lane.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Hedges and trees present. Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species, but the impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Red	<p>Development could have a detrimental impact on designated heritage assets, but the impact could be reasonably mitigated</p> <p>Heritage & Conservation Officer (SN0459) – Amber. PP granted for development on the south side of the road impacts on the original HELAA score and that development impacts upon the setting of church Farm. Development of this site would not result in additional adverse impact although consideration should be given to having some space and reestablishment of the hedgerow to the corner/Muir Lane to enhance rural character at junction. Development to take into account the wider setting of Church Farm as seen from the junction.</p> <p>HES Amber score</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	<p>Development would not result in the loss of any open space.</p> <p>The proposal is to create a new village green of 1ha.</p>	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Any potential impact on highway network could be reasonably mitigated. NCC to confirm.</p> <p>FP6 along west boundary.</p> <p>Highways score (SN0459) – Amber. Adjacent cul-de-sac not adopted so not available for pedestrian link to Church Road. C/w narrow at 3.6m (measured via NMB). Possible land available for f/w but would require removal of what may be a privately owned hedge. C/w could be widened</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>over length of site frontage to allow safe access from east but safe pedestrian access to existing settlement is problematic.</p> <p>Highways Meeting (SN0459) - Subject to carriageway widening of Church Road to 5.5m between the existing layby west of the site to the junction with Muir Lane and at Muir Lane for full extent of site frontage. Provide 2.0m footway for full extent of Church Lane frontage and from Muir Lane junction north to the existing bus stop. Bus stops to be upgraded to comply with DDA requirements.</p>	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Residential development already approved on site to south. Consider impacts could be mitigated. Technical officer to confirm	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No formal access currently. NCC to advise and confirm status of verge to allow footpath extension	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Part of larger parcel of agricultural land. Open boundaries to north, east and south. Hedgerow along PROW on western boundary and partial hedgerow to north on eastern boundary.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow to eastern and western boundary along PROW.	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	Open in wider views from north and east. Site prominent in views along highways.	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>Consider that impacts of development likely to be reasonably mitigated subject to footpath improvement and satisfactory access. To include screening of boundaries to minimise wider visual impact. Suitable for allocation for approximately 33 dwellings in estate layout to reflect character and density of surrounding development.</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
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)	Within 5 years	Green
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)	Statement from promoter including landscape and utilities assessments.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Access and footpath improvement - NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	A 1 acre village green is proposed on the frontage, alongside circa 15 parking spaces related to the nearby school, plus the possibility of a public building and further parking.	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site itself has no overriding constraints and is suitable for development subject to satisfactory layout and density and footpath/access improvements.

Site Visit Observations

Consider that impacts of development likely to be reasonably mitigated subject to footpath improvement and satisfactory access. To include screening of boundaries to minimise wider visual impact. Suitable for allocation for approximately 33 dwellings in estate layout to reflect character and density of surrounding development.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations – open countryside

Availability

Promoter/developer has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

No significant constraints to delivery identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a REASONABLE site subject to its development taking into account the highways requirements, and at a density/with landscaping to reflect the edge of village location. Following discussion with the Parish Council, the site would deliver benefits of a village green and parking to alleviate issues with the school (plus the potential for a further community building and parking, if required/supported locally. Impacts associated with development in this location could be reasonably mitigated.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 28 April 2022

Officer: Kate Fisher

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5010
Site address	Land west of Heather Way, Great Moulton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Adjacent to south of site; 2019/1831/F for 15 dwellings, withdrawn 17/12/2019 resubmitted as 2020/0130/F for 14 (7 AH) approved.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.05
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	10-20 (would be 51 if @ 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	<p>Submission states has access. Access has been left from Heather Way through recently approved development which currently serves seven plots also access has been retained from High Green with a footpath being provided through to Heather Way.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. Not clear how access might be achieved, needs clarification. Wider highway network not suitable for development, no footway to catchment primary school.</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - NCC find it difficult to support sites where walking to school is not a realistic possibility. Access from either High Green or Heather Way would be acceptable; although the latter would need to be designed to prevent further incremental development to the north. The main problem is the wider network in the immediate vicinity, which is narrow, with limited footways.</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>Aslacton Primary School; 2,000m 2 routes, although no path or lighting.</p> <p>Bus stop, limited service Norwich to Diss: 400m on Woodrow Lane, although no path or lighting.</p> <p>Limited employment within 1800m</p>	N/A
<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 	N/A	<p>Pub, Fox & Hounds; 650m Village Hall: 1,300m</p> <p>Further away: Tibenham Community Hall and playing field</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	<p>No known constraints. Likely to be available because of surrounding development.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Overhead cables	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	No known issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>SWFD 1:1000 - 2 small areas to north centre of site. SWFD 1:100 – 2 smaller areas to north centre of site. An attenuation pond could be used to mitigate this.</p> <p>Adjacent site has a new ditch system and an attenuation pond.</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. The site is adjacent to a flow path. This must be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>The on-site flood risk is minor flooding that could be associated with the adjacent flow path but the EA surface water mapping indicates it is separate ponding. We advise this must be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>A large area of the site is unaffected by flood risk and has the potential to be developed.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	

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 Plateau Farmland (small NW corner)	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	B1 - Tas Tributary Farmland E2 – Great Moulton Plateau Farmland (small NW corner) Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate (Green)	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is open and flat. It currently is visible from the south at High Green however once the approved development is completed the	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>frontage of High Green will become part of the built-up area of the village. The site is part of the same field and is contained to the northern boundary with an established hedge-line. This is on the same line as the existing bungalow development on Farrow Close and would not encroach beyond into the open countryside. This means that new development would be well contained; on two sides by residential which is largely within the development boundary and by field boundaries to the north and west.</p> <p>SNC Landscape Officer - PROW in proximity to the site; would need to consider appropriate northern boundary; open landscape. No issues with using existing access from either Heather Way or High Green.</p>	
Townscape	Green	<p>There is a mix of dwellings surrounding the site; bungalows around Heather Way & Farrow Close and fronting High Green to the south-east with the new detached properties to the south and older houses opposite on High Green. Development could be assimilated, graduating from two storey to single storey, with no significant detriment to the townscape.</p> <p>The amount of development would need to take account of the scale of the village.</p> <p>SNC Heritage Officer - Consideration should be given to connectivity with adjacent developments; no townscape issues.</p>	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designations. Mature hedge-lines important to retain as green corridors for biodiversity.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>Monoculture field – low habitat value.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ but housing not listed - discharge of more than 5m³/day to ground requires Natural England consultation. Ponds within 250m - amber risk zone for great crested newts. Not in Green Infrastructure Corridor.</p>	
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Closest listed buildings are on south side of High Green. Other development lies between therefore no adverse impact.</p> <p>HES – Amber</p> <p>SNC Heritage Officer – No heritage issues.</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Well-connected within the existing road network.</p> <p>No safe walking route to school. The railway lies beyond to the west, no station nearby.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Not clear how access might be achieved, needs clarification. Wider highway network not suitable for development, no footway to catchment primary school.</p>	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to east and south. Field to north.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments 09/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Not in a conservation area and no close by listed buildings. Adjacent to existing residential development and new development which is under construction on High Green. Limited additional impact as would read as part of the village along High Green. Would relate well to the existing housing.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	There is a gate from Heather Way and recently approved development has access through, would need HA advice. No footpaths along High Green.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural. Nothing on the site, no demolition required.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat, slight slope – nothing significant.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Currently open to road frontage along High Green, due to change with new development. Hedge boundaries contain the site to north and west. 1960/70s residential development to east.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No, just hedgerows mentioned above.	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 lines crossing the site diagonally east-west. No evidence of contamination, unlikely given arable use.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site from south will be limited when new development is completed. Some views from Heather Way and Farrow Close from east and	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments <i>09/02/22</i>	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	limited views from dwelling to west because of hedge screening. Limited public views – some from Hallowing Lane and some from railway line. No long views and the site doesn't encroach into the countryside beyond the existing line of development.	
<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 related to existing development and contained so limited impact on the landscape. No vegetation within site, and boundaries could be retained therefore low impact on wildlife and no loss of planting. Additional native planting would be needed along northern boundary adjacent to open countryside to delineate and add habitat, also good pedestrian links to existing village to east and south.</p> <p>If taken forward would need to carefully consider the density and height of dwellings to best integrate and transition into countryside.</p>	Green

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)
Adjacent: GRE1 Residential		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 – owner has full control.	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

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. 14 units adjacent approved and commenced with same landowner, T. Heather. Being developed in partnership with Saffron Housing Trust Ltd. Adjacent site increased affordable units because of high demand in village. Architect in place. Indicates it is deliverable.	Green
Are on-site/off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes, over 15 units and there is a requirement for open space. Even if fewer than 15 were to be considered it should be viewed cumulatively with the adjacent new site as together they create a need for open space. This can be provided on-site. If the site is considered there would be an opportunity to seek an open space to benefit the whole village e.g. a village green or village	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
	orchard, as it is well located with two pedestrian accesses and it is a large site.	
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated will provide and already partnered with Saffron. Greenfield site in one ownership, no ransom strips therefore no issue with viability anticipated.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Not at this stage	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site lies immediately north of an allocation for 10 dwellings in the current Local Plan (of which three have been completed) and to the west of a four dwelling affordable housing scheme at the western end of Heather Way. Whilst the site is current very open to the High Green frontage, this would be completely changed by completion of the already allocated development; otherwise, the site is relatively contained to the east and west. There appear to be few on-site constraints. Access could be achieved either from High Green via the allocation site, or via Heather Way to the east. The settlement has relatively few facilities, which, together with some flood risk on the northern part of the site and the need for care in landscape terms, could limit the scale of development.

Site Visit Observations

Well related to existing development and contained so limited impact on the landscape. No vegetation within site, and boundaries could be retained therefore low impact on wildlife and no loss of planting. Additional native planting would be needed along northern boundary adjacent to open countryside to delineate and add habitat, also good pedestrian links to existing village to east and south.

If taken forward would need to carefully consider the density and height of dwellings to best integrate and transition into countryside.

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, and is in the same ownership as the existing adjacent allocation site, which has commenced. That site has been delivered in conjunction with Saffron Housing, to deliver an overall higher affordable housing percentage than required by Policy. Would need to consider whether the site numbers should be considered in conjunction with the existing development re. the requirement for open space.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Development of the full 2+ha is likely to be out of keeping with the scale of the settlement and the available facilities. The northern part of the site is also identified as being at flood risk and considered more sensitive in landscape terms. However, the site is relatively unconstrained and relates well to the allocated and permitted dwellings in the immediately to the south and east. As such, a more limited development on the southern part of the site would be appropriate.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 27/04/2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5048
Site address	Land east of Woodrow Lane, Great Moulton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.5
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	None 12-13 @ 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	Via existing dwelling by demolishing garage and outbuildings. NCC Highways – Red. Safe access not achievable. Remote from services, no footway available to catchment school, local network not of suitable standard.	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	2,100m walk to primary school (no footpath) Limited employment within 1800m Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops 100m from site	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"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	No public house, village hall, pre-school or recreation facilities within 1800m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green	Same as for existing dwelling. Environment Agency: Green	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	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	No known issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	None identified. Flood Zone 1. LLFA: Amber. No surface water flood risk. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. Environment Agency: Green	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Plateau Farmland	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	E2 – Great Moulton Plateau Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; 3 Good to moderate (Green)	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	It would not have a significant impact on the wider landscape but there would be concern about the loss of mature trees as they are a positive contribution to the general landscape character in this area.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	It would not enhance the townscape although it would not be widely visible outside the site because it is behind existing development. There are several large, detached properties with very large rear gardens which have been specifically excluded from the development boundary to preserve the character of the area. Developing this site would be out of character with the form of development in this part of Woodrow Lane.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	There is existing beneficial habitat as a large garden area and new development may have a negative impact particularly interrupting the north-south corridor for wildlife movement adjacent to the railway. NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ but housing not listed - discharge of more than 5m ³ /day to ground requires Natural England consultation. Ponds within 250m - amber risk zone for great crested newts. Not in Green Infrastructure Corridor. Environment Agency: Green	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets. HES - Amber	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Connected via access onto Woodrow Lane which runs through the villages and does have a bus route.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Safe access not achievable. Remote from services, no footway available to catchment school, local network not of suitable standard.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Residential dwellings and gardens.</p> <p>Railway line to east boundary.</p>	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated Sept 2009 and Google Earth 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No nearby assets, not in a conservation area. An additional access would intensify the development at this point where the dwellings are large and well-spaced out with large curtilages.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	There is an existing access serving the single detached dwelling. It is on the outside of the bend, Highway Authority would need to clarify if visibility is adequate for additional development.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential; large dwelling and garden to rear. Would need to demolish garage and outbuildings, presumably necessitating a new garage.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential. Large gardens which are characteristic of this area. Would mean loss of trees which have amenity value.	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)	Mature boundaries – trees.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Mature boundaries – trees.	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, unlikely as it is residential curtilage.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated Sept 2009 and Google Earth 2021)	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	Limited public views as this is a rear garden behind existing large dwellings and mature trees. May be views from the railway line to rear (east).	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)	<p>The proposal appears out-of-character with the area and contrived by building behind the large dwellings via an access between. It would mean the loss of a large garden area and could set an undesirable precedent for the future.</p> <p>An access for a significant number of dwellings past the side of the existing house would have an unacceptable impact on the existing residential amenity. It would appear cramped. In addition, development would put pressure on existing trees now and in the future.</p>	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
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	No indication	Red
Comments:	No information given	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)	Unlikely given size and location to rear of dwellings.	Red
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No information given	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site would represent a breakout to the rear of an established line to the rear of dwellings, and although visibility from the highway would be limited, it would be detrimental to the townscape of the area. The site would potentially set an undesirable precedent which could affect a number of mature trees in established gardens. Whilst the site is adjacent to the existing development, it is at them limit in terms of acceptable distances to services, and the highway authority do not consider that a safe access for additional development can be achieved.

Site Visit Observations

The proposal appears out-of-character with the area and contrived by building behind the large dwellings via an access between. It would mean the loss of a large garden area and could set an undesirable precedent for the future.

An access for a significant number of dwellings past the side of the existing house would have an unacceptable impact on the existing residential amenity. It would appear cramped. In addition, development would put pressure on existing trees now and in the future.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability

The site promoter has not given any indication on the timing of the availability of the site.

Achievability

No information provided to support the deliverability of site provided

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Despite being adjacent to the existing Development Boundary, the site is at the limit in terms of acceptable distances to services and the highway authority has questioned the ability to achieve a safe access. The site would also be out of keeping in townscape terms, setting an undesirable precedent for other large mature gardens in the immediate vicinity.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022