

Forncett St Mary & Forncett St Peter
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

Contents

SN5027	3
--------------	---

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5027
Site address	Land north of Station Road, Forncett St Peter
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Various householder applications for Station bungalow. Site to south: 2011/0016 Removal of Oil Depot and redevelopment for 17 dwellings Outline approved. 2014/0290 Reserved matters approved.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Up to 1.80ha with 0.67ha for residential and remaining as public open space/woodland
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	45 dwellings at 25dph on 1.80ha 17 dwellings at 25dph on 0.67ha
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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
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>There is an existing access to service the site. Promoter has suggested that, should it be necessary, a new access point can be created further eastwards along Station Road. This could improve visibility given the access as existing is in relatively close proximity of a bend in the highway.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Unlikely to be able to achieve satisfactory visibility due to road alignment. Network poor alignment adj to site, forward vis concern, no footway to catchment primary school.</p>	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Primary School; 1,700m</p> <p>Long Stratton;- Manor Field Infants; 2,700m High School; 2,600m Medical practice; 2,200m</p> <p>Bus stop located 50m along Station Road. Bus service 1 (Konect): runs to Diss to Norwich 4/5 times 6 days a week.</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>Fornsett Village Hall; 1,600m Long Stratton Leisure Centre; 2,300m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Red	<p>Promoter states that there is no evidence to suggest that utilities capacity will be a constraint.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Amber. Mains Foul drainage goes to Fornsett St Peter WRC - this serves 93 people and we do not have any measured flow information for it. Permitted Dry Weather Flow (DWF) data is recorded as 31.3 m3/day. This equates to around 90 houses in total, so this WRC would likely have limited capacity as already serves 93 people. Further consideration would need undertaking in liaison with AWS.</p>	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter indicates that provision will need to be made for utilities infrastructure and given the	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		predominantly greenfield nature of the site, such utilities are readily available and given the proximity of existing development that includes the recent Hunts Mead residential development opposite.	
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	No known ground stability issues. Variety of existing uses – may need investigation.	Amber
Flood Risk	Red	<p>Flood Zone 1 Surface Water Flood Risk 1:30 High Risk running straight through the open, developable part of the site.</p> <p>LLFA– Amber. Surface water flood risk, would not prevent development but would need significant mitigation. The site is affected by minor flowpath in the 3.33% AEP event and minor/moderate flow path in the 0.1% AEP event. The flow path cuts the site southeast-west. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows west off of the site. This needs to 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>Any water leading from off-site to on-site should be considered as part of any drainage strategy for the site.</p> <p>EA mapping indicates high water depth in the flow path.</p> <p>Access to the site may be affected</p>	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		by the on-site and off-site flood risk.	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i> Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Tributary Farmland Rural River Valley adjacent to north-west along railway line.	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	B1 – Tas Tributary Farmland A1-Tas Rural River Valley adjacent to north-west along railway line. Agricultural Land classification: Non-agricultural use	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The developable areas of the site are contained and would have very little impact on the wider landscape providing the wood and trees are retained.	Green
Townscape	Green	The developable area is contained and there are dwellings to the south where Hunts Mead has created a cul-de-sac. However this site would extend to the north of Forncett Road and would add to development in a location that is completely separated from the main part of any settlement.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	The paddock area has relatively low habitat value being solely grass but it does form a link between the wooded area and hedge lines	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>surrounding. Would require investigation.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Green. Avoid development in woodland (not identified as priority habitats). SSSI IRZ - allocation of 43 houses falls below threshold for consultation for residential/ rural residential.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Forncett St Peter WRC discharges to the Tas, a tributary of the River Yare. This river is likely to be in the Nutrient Neutrality area, where off-setting of development is required for development to protect the European sites of Yare Broads & Marshes.</p>	
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No nearby heritage assets affected, closest is approx.150m away.</p> <p>The railway line is a Site of Archaeological Interest.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>There is a road link to Long Stratton and consequently through to the A140.</p> <p>Station Road has bus stops however pedestrian access in either direction is dangerous, no footpath and unlit. No safe route to school.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Unlikely to be able to achieve satisfactory visibility due to road alignment. Network poor alignment adj to site, forward vis concern, no footway to catchment primary school.</p>	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural. Railway line along entire north-west boundary.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact on historic environment. It is acknowledged that there has been relatively recent development opposite at Hunts Mead but this was a brownfield site and was considered an improvement on the previous oil depot. This site is different and, in townscape terms, it would represent a consolidation of development in this unsustainable location.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Two existing accesses, one to the bungalow and one further north-east to the area of grassed land. Both on the outside of a severe bend and would require Highway Authority consult. No paths or streetlights and access by foot to any facilities would be dangerous.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Part residential; Station Bungalow, part wooded, part open grassland (pastureland).	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential, woodland, railway. Would the railway restrict development in close proximity?	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level with a slight slope south-north and up from the road access.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Native hedge to frontage, tree belt to rear and wooded area to north-east.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant habitat with adjacent wooded area and hedges. Also pond in relatively close proximity to south, would need Ecologist advice.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	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)	Telephone line across part of frontage.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Minimal views from roadside but otherwise no long views as site is contained by woodland, railway and existing dwelling.	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>Only part of the total site identified would be developable for residential, the wooded area would have to remain, as would the tree belt along the railway.</p> <p>However, although there are facilities in Long Stratton and Forncett St Peter, these are not accessible by foot given the lack of footpath and dangerous road conditions. This would be development in an unsustainable location.</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	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)	Promoter states that the site is viable, no evidence submitted.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Possible open space, access improvements.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter indicated that it would be provided, no evidence to support viability.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Would be willing to make the wooded area to the north/east of the site accessible to the public on allocation.	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation. The Highways Authority and LLFA have identified issues with the development of the site. In addition, the Environmental Agency has also flagged issues with Forncett St Peter WRC discharging into the Tas, a tributary of the River Yare.

Site Visit Observations

Only part of the site identified would be developable for residential, the wooded area would have to remain, as would the tree belt along the railway. However, although there are facilities in Long Stratton and Forncett St Peter, these are not accessible by foot given the lack of footpath and dangerous road conditions. This would be development in an unsustainable location.

Local Plan Designations

Outside development boundary. Located within Tributary Farmland, Rural River Valley adjacent to north-west along railway line.

Availability

The site is promoted by an Agent on behalf of the Landowner and appears available based on the information provided

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered an UNREASONABLE option for development. The site is heavily constrained by highways; the site is unable to achieve satisfactory visibility due to the existing road alignment. In addition, the surrounding road network is poor where the adjacent road alignment to site would result in forward visibility concerns which is exacerbated by no footway to catchment primary school. With regards to surface water flood risk, the LLFA have also highlighted that whilst the known flood issues would not prevent development, they would need significant mitigation. It has also been noted that the access to the site may be affected by the on-site and off-site flood risk.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022