

Keswick & Intwood Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

Contents

SN5042	3
--------------	---

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5042
Site address	Land east of Keswick Barn, Intwood
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.66
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	1-6 16.5 at 25dph
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	Red	No formal access. It would be along a gated, dead-end, unsurfaced lane which is also a footpath (Keswick FP8). NCC Highways – Red. No direct access to highway. Network poor, remote, no footway to school/local facilities.	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	Cringleford stores 1,570m Bus stop within 2,250m 10A Network Norwich Cringleford Primary School over 3km Doctors 2,260m No footpaths until you get to Cringleford or Swardeston. It is 1,500m to the Swardeston B1113 where there is a footpath. Bus stops, Village hall.	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p><i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	<p>Nursery and Pavilion/Recreation Ground, range of services in Cringleford just over 2km</p> <p>Tesco; over 3km</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity		Promoter states that provision will need to be made for key utilities.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	None identified by landowner/agent	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Under consideration for further upgrades.	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>No evidence of contamination or ground instability.</p> <p>NCC Minerals & Waste - site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that - future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1 (Flood Zone 2&3 close to the north)</p> <p>1:1000 risk of surface water flooding through the centre of the site.</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Surface water flood risk, would not prevent</p>	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>development, standard information would be required at the planning stage. There is a major flow path immediately adjacent west of the site. This must be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>Access to the site could be severely affected by off-site flood risk.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i></p> <p>Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland</p>	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
<p>SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i></p>	N/A	<p>C1 Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3</p>	N/A
<p>Overall Landscape Assessment</p>	Red	<p>The site is in the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone which seeks to retain the openness of the zone and where possible enhance the landscape setting of the southern bypass.</p> <p>The site is relatively contained but residential development would significantly alter the landscape character along this secluded lane. It would be publicly visible from the footpath and close to the tributary to the north.</p>	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Development would have a detrimental impact on the landscape which could not be reasonably mitigated.	
Townscape	Red	Any concentration of development in this location would be out of character with the rural area. There is no nearby development aside from the adjacent dwelling which has been converted from agricultural buildings.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Environmentally Sensitive Area to north-west of site. There are significant tree boundaries and a woodland area nearby, along with nearby water all of which are important habitats. This site forms part of that rural landscape and network of habitats. NCC Ecologist: Green. No Priority habitat (MAGIC) but within GI corridor. Green risk zone for Great Crested Newts. Adjacent to PROW Keswick FP8. SSSI ISZ - but residential and discharge of water not identified for NE consultation.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Site of Archaeological Interest directly to the north, opposite. HES – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of its road width, lack of footways. Site is remote from local services and catchment primary school. No continuous footway to catchment school. NCC Highways – Red. No direct access to highway. Network poor,	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		remote, no footway to school/local facilities.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Converted barn, agricultural, river, footpath and woodland.	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	None	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	The site does not have a frontage with an adopted road. The access would have to be significantly improved along a land which is shared with a footpath. The local roads are very narrow with no footpaths or lighting and few passing places.	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 and residential, compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level and flat.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges to north and west, open to field to south. Woodland to eastern side.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Yes, adjacent is an area of woodland.	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, contamination very unlikely given agricultural use of site.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	<p>Limited views into the site given the trees adjacent to Swardeston Lane. Similarly views out would be limited apart from to the south.</p> <p>If developed there would be public views into the site from the footpath along the track to north.</p>	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>The site is remote from services and facilities and the routes are narrow and unlit making walking difficult. It is an isolated site and development would have a significant impact on the character of the rural area as well as the landscape.</p>	<p>Red</p>

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Norwich Policy Area		N/A
Norwich Southern Bypass Land Protection Zone		N/A
Viewing Cone		N/A
National Grid Overhead Line – with buffer		
Conclusion	Significant conflict with Local Plan Policies	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 – state have had enquiries.	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	Red
Are on-site/off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes, access improvements.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated that would comply with affordable housing requirements.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is unsuitable for allocation due to the detrimental impact on the landscape and highways issues, that are considered unresolvable through reasonable mitigation. In addition, located opposite the site is a site of Archaeological Interest directly to the north.

Site Visit Observations

The site is remote from services and facilities and the routes are narrow and unlit making walking difficult. It is an isolated site and development would have a significant impact on the character of the rural area as well as the landscape.

Local Plan Designations

The site is defined as countryside. It is also located within the following LP designations: Norwich Policy Area, Norwich Southern Bypass Land Protection Zone, Viewing Cone and National Grid Overhead Line – with buffer.

Availability

The landowner/developer has advised that the site is available now.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** for development. Development of the site for residential use would be out of character with the rural area. The site is also protected by the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone which seeks to retain the openness of the zone and where possible enhance the landscape setting of the southern bypass. It is considered that development would have a detrimental impact on the landscape which could not be reasonably mitigated. In addition, the Highways Authority have advised that there is no safe and suitable access to the site, the local network is poor with no footway (or possible provision of footway) to the school. The site is also located to the south of a Site of Archaeological Interest and has significant tree boundaries and a woodland area nearby, along with nearby water all of which are important habitats. The culminative effects of these impacts would have a negative impact on the area and as such development of the site is considered unsuitable.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022