

Stoke Holy Cross, Shotesham & Caistor
St Edmund Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

Contents

GNLP0202.....	3
SN2091REVA	13

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	GMLP0202
Site address	Land north of and adjoining Long Lane, Stoke Holy Cross
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.3 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Residential development with landscaping and open space (Promoted for up to 20 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 20 dwellings (approx. 15 dwellings per hectare) 32 dwellings 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	Amber	<p>A suitable access could be achieved. Highway constraints could potentially be overcome through development. NCC to confirm if access is achievable either via the development to the west which adjoins the site or from Long Lane.</p> <p>NCC Highways -Amber. Subject to achieving acceptable visibility, provision of 2m wide frontage footway to link with existing facilities and carriageway widening to 5.5m, along with speed limit extension. 2 points of access. One onto the existing estate road, the other onto Long Lane.</p> <p><i>(Highways meeting 06/01/21 - the majority of development would need to be from a shared access with the recently completed Ingram Homes site (Harrold Place), which will need to be widened to 5.5m. Would also benefit from some frontage development onto Long Lane, to help reinforce the 30mph limit.)</i></p>	Amber

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>Nearest school is Stoke Holy Cross Primary School (opposite side of Long Lane) – c. 225 m</p> <p>There is a bus stop within walking distance. First - Charcoal Line 40, 41 and X41 – c. 575m</p> <p>There is a PH and fish and chip shop in the village which may offer some very limited employment opportunities as well as some existing businesses – up to 1.2km</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Village Hall located to the west of the site. Pre-School operates through the village hall – c.650m</p> <p>Playing field, football pitch's and over and under 12's play area and skate park – c.285m</p> <p>Public House and restaurant – up to 1.2km</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Enhancements to water supply and sewerage infrastructure network to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known constraints in relation to utilities infrastructure or contamination/ground stability	Green
Flood Risk	Green	The site is at low risk of flooding	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Tas Rural River Valley ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site within an attractive valley landscape (Tas Valley) and would be visible in longer views across the valley. Some containment around field boundaries. SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER - Significant concerns with this site – it is not considered to be acceptable in landscape terms. The site is prominent in views across the valley and further development in this location would exacerbate an already poor situation	Red
Townscape	Green	Site would extend the settlement edge along Long Road, following the line of the recently completed development to the west. SENIOR DESIGN AND CONSERVATION OFFICER – Green. This site continues the exiting development from the west.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Hedges around all site boundaries with some hedge trees NCC ECOLOGY – Green. Orange DLL habitat risk zone for great crested newts. SSSI IRZ.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No impact on heritage assets SENIOR DESIGN AND CONSERVATION OFFICER – Green HES - Amber	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No impact on public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Rural local road network. Highway constraints could potentially be overcome through development. NCC to confirm if there is enough capacity in network.</p> <p>NCC Highways -Amber. Subject to achieving acceptable visibility, provision of 2m wide frontage footway to link with existing facilities and carriageway widening to 5.5m, along with speed limit extension. 2 points of access. One onto the existing estate road, the other onto Long Lane.</p> <p><i>(Highways meeting 06/01/21 - the majority of development would need to be from a shared access with the recently completed Ingram Homes site (Harrold Place), which will need to be widened to 5.5m. Would also benefit from some frontage development onto Long Lane, to help reinforce the 30mph limit.)</i></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural fields to north and east and residential properties to south and west.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No likely impact on heritage assets although the site would elongate the village to the north – townscape impact	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be taken through the recently completed site to the west or from Long Lane. NCC have raised concerns regarding the local road network. This may be possible to overcome subject to NCC confirming on network.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural field	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural fields to north and east and residential properties to south and west. Uses are generally compatible with a residential development.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature trees and hedges around site boundaries with some matures trees.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Mature hedgerows and 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 existing infrastructure or contamination	N/A
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 from the north and east will likely have an impact on the rural landscape character. Impact on the valley setting.	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>Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the rural landscape valley. However the site appears to form a logical extension to the existing settlement in this location.</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)
		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Does not conflict with 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 ownership	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?	Immediately/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)	Supporting information from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Possible upgrades to water supply and foul water network. Off-site highway improvement works would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed delivery but no additional evidence submitted at this time	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None proposed as part of the site promotion	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation and relates well to the existing settlement. It also benefits from good connectivity. Some highway matters have been raised but these could be reasonably overcome. The wider landscape impact resulting from development of this site is a key concern.

Site Visit Observations

Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the rural Tas Valley landscape however the site would form a logical extension to the existing settlement in this location subject to appropriate mitigation.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

This site is considered to be a REASONABLE site for allocation within this settlement. The site relates well to the existing settlement and benefits from good access to the local services. Access to the site would be achievable and off-site highway works could reasonably address the highways issues identified. However, development of this site would have an impact on the wider landscape setting, in particular in long views across the Tas Valley, and this would be difficult to mitigate.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 31 July 2020

Officer: Kate Fisher

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2091REVA
Site address	Land West of Norwich Road, Stoke Holy Cross
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2019/0221/O for 4 dwellings withdrawn 03/05/2019. 1987/1435/O for 8 dwellings refused 01/07/1987.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.7ha 2.5ha landscaped area
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Settlement limit extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 3 dwellings with landscaped area to south and west
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	A suitable access and widening of footpath appear to be achievable by development of the site. <i>Previously for larger site (SN2091):</i> NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. <i>Subject to widening frontage footway to 2m.</i>	Amber
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 	Green	Nearest school is Stoke Holy Cross Primary School – c. 1.2km There is a bus stop within walking distance. First - Charcoal Line 40, 41 and X41 – c. 300m There is a PH and fish and chip shop in the village which may offer some very limited employment opportunities as well as some existing businesses – c. 1km	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	Village Hall located to the north of the site. Pre-School operates from the village hall – c. 700m Playing field, football pitches and over and under 12's play area and skate park – c. 1.1km Public House and restaurant – c. 1km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known constraints in relation to utilities infrastructure or contamination/ground stability	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No known risk of surface water flooding.	Green

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	Rural River Valley	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	Tas River Valley Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site within an attractive valley landscape. The reduced site area will lessen the impact although there would then not be any existing containment on the south and west boundaries. Need to consider if proposed landscaping and wildlife area would reduce the impact to an acceptable level. Consultation with Landscape Officer required if site is to progress further in the process.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Site would extend the settlement along Norwich Road to towards the church, elongating the settlement further south with an impact on townscape character. A reduced site area would lessen the impact and will retain the linear pattern of development in preference to estate scale site.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Hedges around site boundaries and within site, including trees. Site reduction would lessen impact and the proposed publicly accessible habitat improvement area could increase valuable biodiversity if managed and protected. Enhancements could be sought through the additional land.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development will impact on the setting of the nearby Grade II* listed Church of Holy Cross approximately 100 metres to the southeast, also the C19 rectory which is considered a non-designated heritage asset. These are viewed in a rural context which would be eroded.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Consultation with Senior Heritage and Design Officer required if site is to progress further in the process.	
Open Space	Green	No loss, promoter proposing new public open space.	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Rural local road network. Highway constraints could potentially be overcome through development. <i>Previous consult;</i> NCC HIGHWAYS – Green.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to north and east, agricultural to south and pasture to west. Compatible uses.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit: 09/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p><i>Previous: Impact on the nearby Grade II* listed Church of Holy Cross approximately 100 metres to the southeast. Townscape impact – development in this location has a loose urban grain reflecting transition from rural setting - settlement. Introduction of an estate style development in this location – even at a small scale – would impact on this gateway.</i></p> <p>Three linear plots and landscape enhancements would reduce the impact at this gateway to the village. However, it would still impact on this gateway to the village and the open landscape. Also, it would still be within the setting of the Listed church.</p>	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be taken from Norwich Road.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural fields to south and west and residential to north the east. Compatible uses.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat with a slope away from the road into the valley. The adjacent church car-park is at a significantly higher level, as is the road and properties opposite.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Some trees and hedges to the north site boundary, to be retained and enhanced. Open to east (road frontage), south and west.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Previous: <i>Mature hedgerows and trees. Ecological considerations are that the site is immediately east of the River Tas, within the River</i>	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments <i>Site Visit: 09/02/22</i>	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	<p><i>Valley Landscape designation area, and within the impact risk zone for Shotesham Common SSSI. The constraints identified would need addressing but could potentially be mitigated.</i></p> <p>The suggestion of a habitat improvement area could be implemented with professional advice and add a resource for wider benefit however consideration would need to be given as to how to secure, retain and maintain this.</p> <p>It will be highly visible in the landscape.</p>	
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 existing infrastructure or contamination.	N/A
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 from would have an impact on the rural landscape character. Development would reduce wider views across the valley from the road and footpath.	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)	It is acknowledged that reducing the amount of development reduces the impact. However, concerns remain relating to the impact of developing this site on the rural landscape valley, townscape character and heritage assets.	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)
River Valley		N/A
Norwich Policy Area		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	There is an impact on the River Valley which needs to be considered.	Amber

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 ownership	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/Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting planning statement from promoter, although does not address deliverability. No known significant constraints to delivery.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Access and footpath widening. Possible upgrades to water supply and foul water network	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	This is under the threshold if the landscaped area is not taken into account.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Potential increase in valuable habitat and provision of 2.5 ha public open space/landscaping.	N/A

Part 7 – Conclusion

Suitability The scale of development proposed on the site has been reduced to 3 dwellings on a developable area of 0.7ha. This site is therefore of a suitable size for allocation (even excluding the promoted wildlife area) but is now being promoted as a settlement limit extension due to the numbers proposed. The site is adjacent to an existing settlement limit. Despite the reduced scale earlier identified constraints remain including a significant landscape impact and harm to the setting of nearby designated heritage assets. Identified highways mitigation measures would overcome existing highway constraints.

Site Visit Observations A smaller linear development would be more compatible with the existing townscape but the landscape impact of such a development would remain significant, impacting on the rural landscape and the transition into the settlement. Consider that development of the site would also impact on the significance of the setting of Holy Cross Church, as well as public views from the PROW. Access would appear to be achievable.

Local Plan Designations Norwich Policy Area and River Valley

Availability The site is considered to be available

Achievability Development of the site is considered to be achievable. It has been noted that in addition to the developable area an additional area comprising c. 2.5 ha has also been promoted to the VCHAP as a wildlife / ecological area. This would likely deliver an ecological net gain and enhance biodiversity locally however no evidence has been submitted to support securing the delivery, retention or ongoing maintenance of such a parcel of land.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for development. Despite the proposed reduction in the scale of the development proposed on this site it would continue to have a significant landscape impact, as well as impact on the significance of the setting of Holy Cross Church, and this is considered to be to a detrimental degree. The benefits of the ecological area proposed alongside the developable site area are acknowledged however they are not considered to be sufficient to override the disadvantages that would arise from the development of this site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 4 May 2022