

Brooke, Kirstead & Howe
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

Contents

SN0020SL	3
SN2119	13
SN5016SL	24
SN5058	34

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0020SL
Site address	Rear of 43 High Green, Brooke
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	Recent history relates to the existing dwelling at 43 High Green.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.11ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	SL extension Proposed for 1 dwelling.
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	9 dwellings/ha as promoted
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>Although r/o 43 High Green, in layout terms, the access would initially seem most appropriate via The Mallows Walk, however this may involve a ransom strip and from the permission for The Mallows it would appear that retention of trees on this boundary was an issue. Consequently the proposer has suggested access via the garden of 43 High Green.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber, subject to access from new estate road, which may require third party land.</p>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Primary School <input type="checkbox"/> Secondary school <input type="checkbox"/> Local healthcare services <input type="checkbox"/> Retail services <input type="checkbox"/> Local employment opportunities	Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary School - 625m • Shop/Post Office/Garage - 750m • Park Farm complex - 475m • Bus (King's Head stops, services inc X41 Bungay/Norwich) - 800m • Brooke Industrial Park - 2,500m <p>Various other small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity - inc. vets, care home etc.</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
○ Peak-time public transport			
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village Hall (with recreation facilities and community cafe) - 925m • Pub (King's Head – currently being refurbished) - 775m (White Lion also within 1,800m) Brooke Cricket Club - 950m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified on/close to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for the NR15 1JA area.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not effected.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Greenfield garden land with no known issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	None identified.	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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Tas Tributary Farmland.	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Does not affect a designated landscape. Small site between the recent redevelopment of 49 High Green for 14 dwellings (The Mallows Walk) and the existing properties fronting High Green. The main issue would be whether any development can be achieved without loss trees detrimental to the character of the area.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	43 and 45 High Green are properties within substantial curtilages, fronting the road, but The Mallows Walk is a higher density redevelopment of a brownfield site.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Currently domestic garden. However the trees on this boundary with The Mallows were an issue during that application and there are a number of trees on the site itself.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Wholly within the Conservation Area. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Highways agreed for The Mallows Walk, assume one additional dwelling would be acceptable. Similarly, another domestic access, or shared access with 43 High Green, could be possible. NCC Highways – Amber, subject to access from new estate road, which may require third party land.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to most boundaries, small part bordering arable field.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is within the Conservation Area, with a number of trees which contribute to the character of the area. In layout terms, development would ideally need to front The Mallows Walk and retention of trees on this boundary was an issue during the application.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Assume that access could either be taken from The Mallows Walk, subject to tree retention or direct from High Green.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential garden.	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 majority of the boundary, with small section bordering arable field.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Appears level.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Domestic boundaries with adjoining properties, open to the remainder of the garden of 43 High Green.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	There are a number of trees on site (protected by Conservation Area status), which could prevent development.	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 garden, therefore contamination unlikely.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Public views from The Mallows Walk of the treed part of the garden of 43 High Green.	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>The main concerns with the site are whether an access can be taken off The Mallows Walk, i.e. would there be a ransom strip and could existing trees be retained? or whether a direct access could be taken from High Green. Also the number of trees on site, which are covered by Conservation Area protection.</p>	<p>Amber</p>

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside		N/A
Conservation Area		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Adjoining the existing 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)	No, is the domestic garden of an existing dwelling.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?		
Comments:		Amber

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	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unlikely for a single dwelling	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Not applicable to site of this scale.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No.	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is centrally located within Brooke, with good access to services/facilities. Although the site is between the existing properties fronting High Green and the rent development at The Mallows Walk, the site is also wholly within the Conservation Area, and contains a number of trees protected by that status. Initially the most appropriate layout would appear to be fronting The Mallows Walk, but the retention of trees (or any ransom strip) may make this difficult.

Site Visit Observations

The main concerns with the site are whether an access can be taken off The Mallows Walk, i.e. would there be a ransom strip and could existing trees be retained? or whether a direct access could be taken from High Green. Also the number of trees on site, which are covered by Conservation Area protection.

Local Plan Designations

Open Countryside and Conservation area, although immediately adjoins the Development Boundary.

Availability

Promoted by the site owner.

Achievability

No supporting information submitted.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Unreasonable - Whilst the site is well located in terms of access to services and facilities, it falls wholly within the Conservation Area and includes a number of trees, which if lost could affect that character of the area. Trees, plus a potential ransom strip could prevent access from The Mallows Walk, although alternative access via the garden of 43 High Green should be possible.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST REGULATION-18 CONSULTATION:

Further to the public consultation this site has been reviewed for inclusion within the existing settlement limit and is considered to be a REASONABLE addition to the existing settlement limit. On review it is considered that potential constraints identified during the site assessment process, including the presence of trees on-site which as previously noted are protected by the Conservation Area status of the site, may be dealt with appropriately via the development management process.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: November 2020

Date Updated: 10 May 2022

Officer: Kate Fisher

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2119
Site address	North of High Green/West of Astley Cooper Place
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Previous 'reasonable alternative' in the preparation of the current Local Plan.
Planning History	No recent planning history.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.9ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Smaller part of the site for unto 25 dwellings at 25 dwellings/ha
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Frontage to High Green within the 30mph speed limits area. There is no footway on High Green between the site and the entrance to Astley Cooper Place, approx. 200m from the site. The site promoter has suggested that a suitable footway can be accommodated within the existing highway, although the impact on the character of the Conservation Area would need to be considered.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, not acceptable. Limited forward visibility in vicinity of site & f/w to village centre starts at Astley Cooper Place, not clear that a facility can be provided within the highway in the existing developed area – approx. 200m. Acceptable level of visibility from site access unlikely to be achievable.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting - poor alignment of High Green, with limited forward visibility, and very questionable whether a footway to link with the existing can be</p>	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		achieved. In addition to concerns about the availability of land to create this it would also result in significant damage to the vegetation which is in third party ownership. Previous pre-app on the site suggests a direct link to Astley Cooper Place is not possible.	
<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 	Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Primary School - 825m ● Shop/Post Office/Garage - 950m ● Park Farm complex - 675m ● Brooke Industrial Park 2,700m ● Bus (King's Head stops, services inc X41 Bungay/Norwich) - 1,000m <p>Various other small scale employment opportunities in the vicinity - inc. vets, care home etc.</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 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Village Hall (with recreation facilities) - 1,125m ● Pub (King's Head – currently being refurbished) - 975m (White Lion also within 1,800m) ● Brooke Cricket Club - 1,150m 	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified on/close to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for the NR15 1JD area.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not effected.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Greenfield site with no known issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Area of surface water flood risk (inc 1:100 year) running diagonally northeast/southwest across the site, along the line of vegetation. LFFA - 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>)		Tas Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	No designated landscapes. Site well contained by vegetation, although this would depend how much needed to be removed to provide a workable layout on an unusually shaped site. Grade 3 Agricultural Land SNC Landscape Meeting - unfortunate removal of maturing trees and hedgerows would be required; potential off-site issues if trees to be removed on third party land, which would seem likely to create the required footway.	Green
Townscape	Amber	Frontage development on High Green is generally low density with mature planting and rural in appearance. This frontage development also forms part of the Conservation Area. However moderately higher density estate	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		type development does exist to the rear of properties on the north side of High Green, at Astley Cooper Place, Coniston Road, Brecon Road etc. The orientation/shape of the site would lead to a liner form of development, running roughly at a right angle to High Green.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Small area of TPO trees (Wood Farm) along the eastern boundary with Ashley Cooper Way and other parts of the site are also heavily vegetated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	The site adjoins the Conservation Area and has a listed building (66 High Green) in close proximity. SNC Heritage - Concern at the setting of 66 High Green, which unfortunately sits at the back of its curtilage (and also within the setting). I note that there is some open space in the plan is provided but it does not really mitigate impact/harm that much. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Lack of footway along High Green between the site and Astley Cooper Place. The site promoter has suggested that a suitable footway can be accommodated within the existing highway, although the impact on the character of the Conservation Area would need to be considered. Site is within the 30 mph area with reasonable access to the main B1332. NCC Highways – Red, not acceptable. Limited forward visibility in vicinity of site & f/w to village centre starts at Astley Cooper Place, not clear that a facility can be provided within the highway in the existing developed	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>area – approx. 200m. Acceptable level of visibility from site access unlikely to be achievable.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting - poor alignment of High Green, with limited forward visibility, and very questionable whether a footway to link with the existing can be achieved. Previous pre-app on the site suggests a direct link to Astley Cooper Place is not possible.</p>	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Existing residential to the south and east and agricultural to the north and west.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Although close to the Conservation Area, existing development outside of the CA and retention of existing vegetation would limit any impacts.</p> <p>Principal concern would be the impact of the listed building at 66 High Green.</p> <p>In townscape terms any development would be a right angles to High Green, which would need careful consideration, although there is existing similar development at Astley Cooper Place, Coniston Road, Brecon Road etc.</p>	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Site frontage within the 30 mph area.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site, although heavily vegetated. No obvious concerns other than protection of any important trees etc.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Neighbouring land uses are medium/low density residential (south and east) and agricultural (north and west), with no compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Broadly level, rising slightly away from High Green.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow to the site frontage. Heavily vegetated along the western boundary. Domestic scale boundaries with existing residential properties on Astley Cooper Place.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	TPO trees on the eastern boundary. Western Part of the site heavily vegetated and likely to require ecological survey and assessment for TPOing of trees	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Greenfield site, 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	The site is relatively contained, with views into the from High Green and the adjoining residential properties at Astley Cooper Place, with the backdrop of existing vegetation.	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)	The site is relatively well contained, with direct access to High Green. Impacts on the Conservation Area should be limited, although this will need to take into account any works needed to create the necessary footways. However the form of development will need to be carefully considered, given the orientation of the site and the extensive vegetation on site (including, but not exclusively the TPO trees). The adjacent listed building will also be a consideration.	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	Adjacent to the existing Development Boundary to the east.	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 being marketed, but promoted on behalf of the owner by an agent with a land sales experience.	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately	
Comments:	No know legal restrictions to bring the site forward.	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)	Some evidence supplied to address issues raised by the previous GNLP assessment of the site.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Off-site footways	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Potential primary school, if developed in conjunction with the adjoining SN2122, however, the need for this has not been demonstrated.	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Whilst the site is well located in terms of access to local services and facilities, it also has some constraints in terms of: the proximity of the Conservation Area and the listed property at 66 High Green, which it is set at the back of its plot, and which the development is considered will impact detrimentally; extensive areas of vegetation on site, over and above the presence of TPO trees; the need to provide a footway to link to existing provision at Astley Cooper Place (the provision of which could also impact on trees within the Conservation Area; the alignment of/forward visibility on High Green at this location; and small areas of surface water flood risk within the site.

Site Visit Observations

The site is relatively well contained, with direct access to High Green (although this is constrained, see Suitability). However, the site would impact on the setting of 66 High Green and on the wider Conservation Area, particularly if the implementation of a footway required the loss of trees/hedging.

Local Plan Designations

Open Countryside but adjoining the current Development Boundary.

Availability

Landowner knows of no reason why the site could not be developed immediately, and is being promoted by an agent with a land sales experience.

Achievability

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Unreasonable - The site is within a reasonable distance of the services and facilities in Brooke, however there are concerns related to: the suitability of High Green in this location and the ability to achieve a safe access; the ability to achieve a footway to link with existing provision and the impact this could have on the Conservation Area; and the impact on the setting of the Listed dwelling at 66 High Green. The site itself includes areas of surface water flood risk and extensive vegetation.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: November 2020

Officer: Kate Fisher

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5016SL
Site address	Land east of The Green, Howe
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	1988/0818/F for 1 dwelling refused 12/05/1988, appeal dismissed 09/11/1988. Numerous applications earlier in same decade.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.48
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	SL extension However, there is no SL for Howe.
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	5; conversion of barns to 2 units and new build for 3 12 at 25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Has road frontage and a small break in the hedge for access to the barns. In order to achieve visibility splays some of the hedge would need to be removed. NCC Highways – Red. Access would require substantial mature hedge/tree removal & road alignment challenging. Remote, network poor, no footway to 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	Howe does not have any core services. The nearest are in Brooke and Poringland. Limited local employment to the north; 1,300m Brooke Primary School; 2,300m Poringland Primary School; 2,800m High school over 3,000m Bus stop on B1332; 1,000m All accessed along narrow, unlit roads with no footpath and then onto the B1332.	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	Brooke Village Hall; 2,000m Brooke Post Office; 2,200m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known capacity issues Environment Agency: Green	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Owner indicates that the site has access to mains water and electricity.	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	Existing agricultural buildings so would need investigation.	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1. 1:100 Medium risk of surface water flooding, pond on site and to the north. LLFA: Green. At risk of surface water flooding. On-site flood risk is concentrated to a pond feature. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. Environment Agency: Green	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>	N/A	B1 Tas Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 2 Very good (Light Blue)	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Red	The site does not encroach into the open countryside because of the delineated eastern field boundary. However, it forms part of the landscape character of the village and would detract from the wider setting of Howe and the Howe conservation area. Would be public views from the public footpath across the field from the east.	Red
Townscape	Red	There is no development boundary for Howe as it is a small, undeveloped rural hamlet with a very distinct historic character and no recent housing. The site is mainly within the conservation area, western part to the road frontage, and adds a great deal in its current form by way of a green space. Development here would be severely detrimental to the built form, townscape and conservation area. It would also impact on the listed church opposite and necessitate the removal of an established hedge.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No designations. Undeveloped land, grass with old barns therefore potential for habitats including bats. Further investigation would be required. NCC Ecologist: Green. Any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m ³ /day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream requires consultation with	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>Natural England. Pond adjacent to site boundary- site partially with amber risk zone for great crested newts. not in GI corridor.</p> <p>Footpath Howe FP3 passes through site.</p>	
Historic Environment	Red	<p>In the Howe Conservation Area. Listed buildings – Grade II* Church opposite. Possible archaeological interest. Non-designated heritage asset to north, thatched cottage and old school house.</p> <p>New development would significantly impact on the heritage assets.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Red
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Narrow rural roads running through Howe, which is a relatively isolated hamlet. There are no paths and the road is not lit so walking to services would be unrealistic.</p> <p>Prow to south running eastwards (FP3).</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Access would require substantial mature hedge/tree removal & road alignment challenging. Remote, network poor, no footway to school.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Dwelling to the north, School Cottage, and cottages to the south. Church opposite to the south-west and agricultural field to the east boundary,	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Any new development (aside from conversion of existing buildings) would severely impact on the heritage of the area – the conservation area and the listed church.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	<p>There is an existing gap in the hedge to access the barns on the site, but this would need to be improved to get visibility which would mean removing part of the hedge.</p> <p>It is a very narrow rural road. There is informal parking for the church directly opposite the existing access point.</p>	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Unused grass land with some old storage buildings.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	<p>Dwelling to north-west and to the south.</p> <p>Agricultural to east.</p> <p>Churchyard opposite.</p>	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)	Hedges on boundary, some trees.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Pond on site and one close to north, potential for wildlife there and within the site. Also could be bat roosts within existing old buildings and given the mature trees within the churchyard.	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)	<p>Unknown, but would need investigation for contamination because of storage buildings.</p> <p>Telephone wires across the front.</p>	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 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	Views into and out of the site are limited because of vegetation; trees and established hedge. However this would be opened up for access and there would be vies above the hedge of development.	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)	Do not consider this is an acceptable site for new build residential development. This is because of the impact on the heritage assets (designated and non-designated) and the significant affect it would have on the un-developed nature of the village and its distinct rural character in close proximity to the listed church. It is also very remote from all essential services which would mean that these would be almost entirely accessed by car.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Conservation Area		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Negative impact on the Conservation Area	Red

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	Immediately, once site cleared.	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)	Likely to be deliverable although no evidence submitted.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unknown	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated yes although it is under the threshold with the proposed numbers and conversion.	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Howe is a rural hamlet with no currently defined Settlement Limit, as such any proposals would need to the creation of a new Limit, for which there are currently no plans. The site has a number of limitations. It is at the margins in terms of distance to services and the issue is compounded by the local road network being narrow, unlit, with no footways and much of it at the national speed limit. The site itself is within the Conservation Area and opposite the Grade II* listed church and would require the loss of significant frontage hedging/trees to create a suitable access; substantially changing the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the church and other non-designated heritage assets.

Site Visit Observations

Do not consider this is an acceptable site for new build residential development. This is because of the impact on the heritage assets (designated and non-designated) and the significant affect it would have on the un-developed nature of the village and its distinct rural character in close proximity to the listed church. It is also very remote from all essential services which would mean that these would be almost entirely accessed by car.

Local Plan Designations

Concern over the impact on the Conservation Area.

Availability

Site promoter has indicated the site would be available immediately once it has been cleared.

Achievability

Site promoters has indicated the site is deliverable, but no supporting evidence has been submitted.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The proposal is for a Settlement Limit extension in a location which currently has no Limit, and no plans to put one in place. Howe itself has no local services/facilities other than the church. Services are at the margins in terms of distance and the issue is compounded by the local road network being narrow, unlit, with no footways and much of it at the national speed limit, severely limiting the transport options. Creation of a suitable access and development of the site would impact detrimentally on the Conservation Area, the setting of the Grade II* listed church opposite and the other nearby non-designated heritage assets. There is also the potential for the loss of habitat in the old barn structures within a site bounded by trees/hedges.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 29/04/2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5058
Site address	Brooke Lodge, west of Norwich Road, NR15 1JG
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary - unallocated
Planning History	Various historic applications including; 1997/0358 New access to north. 2012/0308/RVC Agricultural occupancy restriction removed on bungalow.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Whole site: 7.3ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for an assisted living residential development for older people with medical facilities and a community garden.
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

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	Frontage to the B1332 Norwich Road with two separate accesses to the north of the site.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Primary School <input type="checkbox"/> Secondary school <input type="checkbox"/> Local healthcare services <input type="checkbox"/> Retail services <input type="checkbox"/> Local employment opportunities <input type="checkbox"/> Peak-time public transport	Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary School - 825m • Shop/Post Office/Garage - 775 • Park Farm complex – 1,100m • Employment - (Brooke Industrial Park) - 1,125m • Bus - Kings Head bus stop (41/X41 services) - 700m <p>Various other small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity (vet, care home etc.)</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village Hall (with recreation facilities and community cafe) - 650m • Pub (Kings Head – currently being refurbished) - 700m (White Lion also within 2km) Brooke Cricket Club – 1,150m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Promoter stated no specific known constraints.	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter stated no specific known constraints.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1 Some very small pockets of surface water flooding within the site.	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>		B1 - Tas Tributary Farmland. B5 – Chet Tributary Farmland lies to the east across the B1332	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	No designated landscapes. The landscape is open with large fields however this is a contained site,	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>within its own substantial mature boundaries, which hides the buildings but makes it a feature in the landscape as a wooded area.</p> <p>Grade 3 Agricultural Land.</p>	
Townscape	Amber	<p>Would extend the growth of Brooke towards Poringland, particularly if the proposed site to the south is developed.</p> <p>This is a specific proposal for a community housing facility and would be considered as a separate, discrete development within its own grounds.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designated sites in close proximity.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Brooke Lodge is a Grade II Listed Building and is within the site. It has a woodland setting which would need to be retained and the impact of development assessed.</p> <p>Distant views of the Brooke Conservation Area from Norwich Road.</p> <p>Archaeological record west of the site.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Frontage to the B1332 Norwich Road and footpaths to the main village services and facilities.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Brooke Lodge is a listed building within grounds which are heavily treed. Development would affect its setting.</p> <p>Some possible impact on distant views of Brooke Conservation Area, although these would appear to be very limited, and the site would remain contained within its wooded setting.</p> <p>Extends the settlement development northwards towards Poringland although this sits as a separate, contained site.</p>	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Direct access to the B1332, may require speed reduction measures.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	The site consists of a Grade II listed country house, a range of offices and a warehouse used by a printing business. There is also a separate bungalow and a range of glasshouses.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural on all sides. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site is level.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	The site has strong boundaries on all sides which mean it is largely not visible from the B1332.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	There are significant mature trees within the site which are the setting for the listed building and mature native hedges surrounding. This would provide significant habitat.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)</p>	<p>Residential use unlikely to be contaminated but have been other uses of the buildings over the years which would need to be checked.</p> <p>Overhead wires run outside to the south of the site.</p>	N/A
<p>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</p>	<p>Views into and out of the site are limited due to its containment. The location of the site as a whole is visible in the open landscape as a wooded area and development would be seen without this level of landscaping.</p>	N/A
<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 and there are no views inside the site because of the level of landscaping. The site is visible when travelling along the B1332 through Brooke and across the wider open agricultural countryside from the footpath network.</p> <p>It is well located in terms of access to services and facilities, and with direct access to the B1332. However, it is not adjacent to existing development and needs to be considered in conjunction with the proposed sites to the south.</p> <p>In addition, this proposal is not for open market housing it is for a residential/older persons facility which needs to be considered. The usual route for this type of proposal is through a planning application.</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)
		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 – single owner	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?	Within 5 years	
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 is in a single ownership and the promoter has confirmed that there are no issues that would impede development. This is the initial stage, and no developer has been identified yet. The proposal is to phase the scheme.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Site owner controls the whole site, therefore land for open space/GI could be made available if required. Highway works to reduce speeds on the B1332 may be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	The proposal is for a private assisted living housing with supporting facilities. It does not specify whether any of these would be available for the local community.	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is relatively well located in terms of access to services and is linked by a footpath. However, it is a large site and is separate to the existing village development.

The land has been promoted for a care community, providing specialist housing of a scale that is not considered appropriate within this plan.

The site may be suitable for some specialist development, subject to no overriding concerns regarding the impact on the listed building and its setting, impact on mature trees and suitable access arrangements from the B1332.

Site Visit Observations

A contained, level site with mature trees and hedges providing the setting for a listed building. However, the site does sit as a feature within the open agricultural landscape with woodlands and Brooke Conservation Area beyond.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, the existing Development Boundary is approx.130m to the south of the site.

Availability

The site is in a single ownership and is available. Viability has not been proven, no evidence of viability has been submitted and there is no developer involved.

Achievability

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: May 2022

Officer: Kate Fisher