



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Updated Site Assessments

Non-allocated sites

January 2023

Contents

SN0433 - Land at Wheel Road, Alington, NR14 7NL.....	3
SN3019SL - Land west of School Road, Bressingham	15
SN4037 - Land to the south of Fersfield Road, Bressingham.....	26
SN4069SL - Land south of Scole Road, Brockdish	36
SN2119 - North of High Green/West of Astley Cooper Place, Brooke.....	47
SN4014 - Land to east of Common Road and south of Beccles Road, Burgh St Peter	58
SN0078 - Land off Loddon Road, Ditchingham	67
SN0345 - Land to the north of Loddon Road, Ditchingham.....	77
SN0218 - Land west of Earsham	87
SN1015 - Land adjacent to the primary school, The Street, Hempnall.....	98
SN0348 - Land to the South of Old Yarmouth Road, Kirby Row, Kirby Cane	107
SN4052 - Land south of School Lane and east of Manor Farm Barns, Little Melton.....	119
SN0418 - Land at Cook's Field, n/o Jocelyn Close, Pulham Market.....	128
SN0405 - Land to North and South of Brooke Road, Seething	138
SN2031 - Land east of Norwich Road, Tacolneston	150
SN2103 - Land north of School Road	160
SN0262 - Land north of Church Road, Woodton	170
SN0268SL - Land north of Church Road, Woodton.....	182
SN2183 - Land south of Wymondham Road, Wreningham.....	194

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0433
Site address	Land at Wheel Road, Alington NR14 7NL
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	No planning applications post-2000 Reasonable alternative in the last Local Plan
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.0
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site. (Promoted for approximately 10 dwellings as a SL extension)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Minimum of 12/ha. (Promoted for 10/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

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	<p>Long frontage to Wheel Road, with existing field access.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting - From a Highways perspective the entire frontage needs improvement; could widen Wheel Road, however this would require substantial hedge removal. Wheel Road narrows outside the Wheel of Fortune, but this relatively short pinch point should be OK. Reeders Lane junction is substandard – could potentially be widened for improved visibility.</p>	Amber
<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 	Amber	<p>Primary School - 450m</p> <p>Aldis & Son Farm Shop - 1,175m</p> <p>Various small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity.</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		Pub - less than 50m Village Hall with Recreation Ground - 775m Yelverton Football Club & Pavilion - 950m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	33Kv overhead lines at the eastern end of the site, may require diversion/effect the layout of development.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for NR14 7NL area.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Greenfield site with no known issues. SNC Env Services: Green Land Quality: - No potentially contaminated sites are located within 500m of the site in question on the PCLR or Landmark databases other than a former agricultural repair workshop (about 120m from the site in question) and a graveyard. Neither of these are	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>considered significant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nothing of concern with regard to land quality noted on the historic OS maps. - Having regard to the size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application. 	
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Small area in the east of the site subject to surface water flooding up to 1 in 100 years.</p> <p>LLFA - Few or no constraints.</p>	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>)		Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>No designated landscapes.</p> <p>Substantial hedge to the road frontage, with mature tree at the Wheel Rd/Reeder's Lane junction. However, hedging likely to be lost to create a suitable access. Aspect to the south is more open and visible from south on Reeder's Lane.</p> <p>Grade 3 agricultural land.</p> <p>SNC Landscape Meeting - Significant boundary/roadside hedgerow and vegetation. Does not appear to be compatible with LCA.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	<p>Postwar housing on the opposite side of Wheel Road, and Wheel of Fortune pub immediately to the east. However this site would extend the settlement into more open countryside south of the village. Potential to screen/integrate the site.</p> <p>SNC Heritage & Design – Amber</p>	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designated sites within close proximity. However some mature hedgerow/tress on the boundary, which are likely to require protection.</p> <p>NCC Ecology – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Red	<p>Potential impact on listed building to the south, Stacey Cottage, which currently has no screening between it and the site.</p> <p>SNC Heritage & Design – Amber, a suitably designed linear development would be fine, if developed to the north along the same line as the FW properties site to the east, this would leave a suitably sized rectangular agricultural field to the south. There is also the Wheel of Fortune to consider as a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space.	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Assuming a suitable access can be achieved the site links to the current network serving the village, which links to the A146 and Poringland.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting - From a Highways perspective the entire frontage needs improvement; could widen Wheel Road, however this would require substantial hedge</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		removal. Wheel Road narrows outside the Wheel of Fortune, but this relatively short pinch point should be OK. Reeders Lane junction is substandard – could potentially be widened for improved visibility.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Pub to the east, road frontage to the north and west, with residential development beyond. Agricultural land to the south.</p> <p>SNC Env Services: Green</p> <p>Amenity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site in question is adjacent to the Wheel of Fortune PH, Wheel Road, Alington, Norfolk, NR14 7NL. Consideration should be given to the potential impact of the Public House on future residents along with the impact on the future viability of the Public House of introducing noise sensitive receptors close to it. 	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Potential impact on the listed Stacey Cottage to the south.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Current field entrance to the site, close to the existing junction with Fortune Green. Substantial hedge, at least part of which may need to be removed. On a bend in Wheel Road and extends to the junction with Reeder's Lane.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, with no obvious concerns.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Pub, residential and open countryside. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Road frontage to Wheel Road and Reeder's Lane, only immediately adjoining development is the pub. Currently no boundary to the south, as the site subdivides a larger field.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Substantial hedgerow, with a ditch, to the Wheel Road frontage, includes tree(s) at the Reeder's Lane junction.	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)	Two sets of overhead powerlines across the site, which may require diversion or accomodating in any development layout.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views of the site from the village are limited by the existing hedge, although any removal to create an access would make the site significantly more open. The site is	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	more open from the south and can be seen through the field entrance on Reeder's Lane.	
<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>Whilst the site is effectively in gap between the Wheel of Fortune pub and housing on Burgate Lane, with additional housing on the opposite side of Wheel Road, the site has a rural feel, with a substantial hedge and ditch to the Wheel Road frontage and a more open aspect to the south.</p> <p>Careful consideration needs to be given to any access, with the bend in Wheel Road and junctions with Reeder's Lane and Fortune Green, plus the potential need to remove at least part of the frontage hedge.</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)
Open Countryside		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion		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 currently being marketed, but is promoted by a house builder.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	
Comments:		G n

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 promoted by an established house builder who also completed the nearby 2015 allocation on Wheel Road. No known constraints to delivery.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Landowner also controls and to the south, should open space/landscaping etc be required. It is not envisaged that further off-site improvements will be required.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes, at the time of submission in 2016	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is an unconstrained greenfield site, relatively well located in terms of access to local services/facilities. Keeping the development to the northern part of the field would limit the impact on the rural setting of Stace Cottage to the south. However, Wheel Road at the site frontage is narrow and has restricted forward visibility and the carriageway narrows in vicinity of the Wheel of Fortune PH. Whilst this 'pinch point' at the pub might be acceptable, the removal of the substantial frontage hedge (containing some larger trees) would significantly change the character of the area. Need to establish whether the 33Kv power lines are a constraint.

Site Visit Observations

Site quite rural in character, and currently well screened from surrounding development. However that screening is likely to need to be removed to access the site.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but on the opposite side of Wheel Road to the existing Development Boundary.

Availability

Promoter is a local house builder who states that the site is available and viable.

Achievability

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is reasonably located in terms of local services and facilities and has few on-site constraints. The main concerns with the site relate to the removal of the substantial frontage hedge (with trees) to facilitate the necessary highways improvements, across the whole site frontage from the Reeders Lane/Burgate Lane junction (which itself would require improvement) to the Wheel of Fortune. This would significantly change the character of the area and raise concerns in terms of wider landscape character.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 5 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3019SL
Site address	Land west of School Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.49 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	SL extension <i>(but could the site be extended by 0.1ha to allow for it to be considered as an allocation?)</i>
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Site promoted for 5-10 dwellings (Site could accommodate 12 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	Green	On site check required re. footpath provision; road frontage Highways score – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. However, site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school.	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	Access to school, public house, village hall Primary School – approximately 125m Bus Service – approximately 945m Shop – approximately 530m	

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 		Village hall and play area – approximately 530m Public House – approximately 650m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints – the site promoter has confirmed availability of most services (excluding gas) to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Fibre technology is already available in this area	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Areas within the eastern section of the site are shown as being at risk of surface water flooding – this forms the site frontage LLFA comments at Regulation 18 consultation – Red. Significant mitigation required for severe	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		constraints; recommend a review of the site and potential removal from the plan; The on-site flood risk is a major flow path in the 0.1% AEP event. It affects the majority of the site. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows south off of the site. We advise this must be considered in the site assessment. Access to the site appears to be heavily affected by the on-site flood risk. A small area of the site is unaffected by flood risk (west). We would advise that inclusion of this site in the plan is reassessed.	

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 with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Waveney Tributary Farmland – open landscape with distant views, mix of building styles including old farm buildings and processing plants	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALV – Grade 3 The site extends the settlement in a linear pattern further into the open countryside, outside of the existing built form	Green
Townscape	Green	Continuation of existing built form along School Road - a linear pattern that is in keeping with the settlement; does not appear to extend the settlement to a detrimental degree Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. This would continue the development on this side of the road with linear development which is very characteristic of Bressingham. There is no existing hedgerow, but	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		being peripheral and an entry to the village, re-establishment of hedgerow and setting building back from road with access drive may be beneficial to the more rural character of the settlement. Plot boundary line does appear to be drawn to allow scope for this. Don't want it to be too urban. Setting building back would also benefit setting of LB opposite	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No anticipated impact however any impact could be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Green	LB opposite site and to south (Pine Tree Cottage and The Spinney) Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. The Setting of Pine Tree Cottage would be affected but agree that suitable development would not result in significant harm if well designed/good materials. The house faces away from the road and has quite an immediate setting. Setting should be mentioned in allocation to ensure better design and materials. HES – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Views of Highways required – GNL HELAA noted an amber score in this category Highways score – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. However, site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to north; open fields to south and west	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	LB opposite the site but do not consider that it would have a significant impact on its setting – check with LB Officer Development of this site could be read as an extension of the recent development at Pascoe Place with a suitable site layout	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Yes – access directly from School Road and an existing footpath already extends along the site frontage	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site is undulating and rises to the north and west- consideration would need to be given to the building heights to address this (e.g., the western-most dwelling at Pascoe Place is single storey)	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	No significant boundaries around the site to the west – no natural site delineation. An access track to a water pump installation forms the southern boundary	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No	
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	There is a water pump to the south west of the site (adjacent to the site)	

Site Visit Observations	Comments	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	The site currently forms part of the gateway into the village on the approach from School Road and has a pleasant open aspect however it is immediately adjacent to the existing boundary of the village	
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 well connected and relates well to the settlement. Development of this site would not have a significant impact on the nearby listed buildings although due to the topography of the land it would be prominent within the landscape. With an appropriate design and layout, the development of this site would continue the existing built form along School Road without significantly encroaching further into the surrounding landscape.	Green

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations identified	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)	Unknown	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No – not requested or submitted	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	As promoted the site size would fall below the required size for affordable housing delivery. The site promoter would need to confirm that a larger number is viable and would deliver the required affordable housing contribution on this site.	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

If the site is extended by 0.1ha or is shown to accommodate 12 dwellings then it would be suitable for a site allocation however the site is not considered appropriate as a settlement limit extension as it would encroach further southwards along School Road.

Site Visit Observations

The site is well related and connected to the centre of the settlement and there is an existing footpath provision. Access is achievable from School Road. The site would be read in the context of the existing development at Pascoe Place which would reduce its visual intrusion into the landscape. The topography of the site, however, means that it may be appropriate to include single or 1.5 storey dwellings to the west of the site.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting Local Plan designations identified

Availability

The site is considered to be available

Achievability

The promoter has not confirmed whether affordable housing could be delivered on the site as it has been promoted for a smaller number of dwellings at this time. For this reason, the site has scored a red rating in this category.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site was initially promoted as a settlement limit extension, however as it is of a scale that is only just below the nominal 0.5ha allocation threshold it has been identified suitable as an allocation. The site is well related and connected to the centre of the settlement where there is an existing footpath provision. Areas within the eastern section of the site are shown as being at risk of surface water flooding, however this forms the site frontage.

POST REGULATION 18 UPDATE:

Technical consultee comments submitted by the Lead Local Flood Authority in response to the Regulation 18 consultation highlighted the severe flood constraints on this site. Further discussions with the LLFA have clarified that this on-site flood risk could not be reasonably mitigated on-site and as a result this site has been reassessed and is considered to be an UNREASONABLE site for development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 18 June 2020

Date Updated: 28 April 2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4037
Site address	Land to the south of Fersfield Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.29ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocated site for up to 20 dwellings with POS, landscaping and infrastructure
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12-20 dwellings
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	Site frontage adjoins Fersfield Road a single track road; drainage ditch along site frontage; no existing footpath provision Highway score – Green	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	Access to services including primary school, public house, village hall Primary School – approximately 300m Bus stop – approximately 265m Village Shop – approximately 495m	

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 		<p>Village Hall, Playground – approximately 495m</p> <p>Public House – approximately 1000m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	The site promoter has advised 'unknown' however the site is adjacent to existing development and it is anticipated that infrastructure would be available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Provision already available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No identified contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Small area of surface water flooding identified in south west corner of the site</p> <p>LLFA score – Green (standard planning information required)</p> <p>Updated LLFA comments post Regulation-18 consultation (meeting 20/10/21) - Flow path begins on site – flood limitations on site could be accommodated by a good sustainable drainage design. A good drainage scheme on this site could have the effect of improving the situation off-site to the south. Development on site does not seem to be problematic however development on both</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		SN4036 and SN4037 could not be supported.	

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>)		Waveney Tributary Farmland – open landscape with distant views, mix of building styles including old farm buildings and processing plants	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALC - Grade 3 Development of the site appears to have limited impact on the landscape when viewed from the east or west. The landscape impact from the north and south may be an issue.	Amber
Townscape	Green	PROW adjacent to the western boundary of the site; infill plot between existing residential properties; adjacent development is linear in form however it also extends along onto School Road; Poplar Farm has a number of agricultural buildings on the site. Senior Heritage & Design Officer - Bressingham is predominantly linear development, and this would result in some clustering. However, at some point linear development becomes detrimental and inefficient, and perhaps the time has come for clustering. farm complex is to west so rear plot line already created. This site will have less impact on existing residents in terms of views/relationship to open countryside – although views are quite expansive compared to SN3019. Restablishing a hedgerow	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		to the lane would be good.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ – potential for protected species and biodiversity net gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	LB Poplar Farm adjacent to the western boundary of the site Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. The LB is in a relatively big plot and existing thick landscaping will separate it from the development. Landscaping and appropriate materials/building design can mitigate harm, particularly along the frontage. HES – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	HA to advise on local road network Highway concerns about the local road network.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential, educational and agricultural land use	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	LB to the north-west of the site is currently well screened behind trees. The site sits between existing residential properties although it is at the edge of the settlement. It can also be seen on the approach north along School Road.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	The site has a road frontage but the road width is narrow (single car) and there is no existing pedestrian access along the site boundary (although the existing pathway could potentially be extended within the site boundary)	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Scrub land	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential, agricultural and education (school playing field)	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site appears to be level although there was dense vegetation across the site so unable to confirm this on the site visit	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	At the time of the site visit the site was bounded by an overgrown PROW and tall trees to the west and vegetation to the east	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	The site is densely covered with vegetation – a mix of large shrubs and small trees. There is an existing tree along the site frontage which would likely need to be removed to allow for safe access and/or visibility. Whilst the tree may not be significant it would be a loss in the landscape. The vegetation covered the ditches but there appeared to be ditches along the northern and western boundaries.	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)	No	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 between two residential properties and due to the surrounding trees the visual impact of development when viewed from Fersfield Road would be minimised. Due to the local topography, development of the site would be visible on the approach north along School Road but this would be viewed within the context of the existing development at Pascoe Place. Loss of the existing vegetation across the site would be necessary in order to develop this site.	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 well connected to the main areas of the settlement and there is potential to join the existing footpath provision. Whilst development would be visible in the landscape from different approaches this would be read in the context of the existing built form and would not be detrimental to the local landscape. Existing vegetation currently provides screening between the site at the adjacent LB.	Green

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	No conflicting LP 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 – multiple site owners	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Enquiries received but the site is not being actively marketed	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No additional evidence requested/ submitted	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes – highways improvements likely to be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Subject to the comments of the technical consultees, the site is considered to be suitable for development. In particular the comments of the highways department and the heritage officer will be key to determining the overall suitability of this site.

Site Visit Observations

The site is well related to the main centre of Bressingham and existing footpath provision could potentially be extended to allow for safe pedestrian access. A small development in this location could relate well to the existing built form and from School Road would be viewed in the context of existing development at Pascoe Place. The loss of the tree along the site frontage would likely be necessary for safe vehicular access and this would be regrettable in terms of the local landscape.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations identified

Availability

The site is considered to be available

Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site relates well to the existing settlement and would not have a detrimental impact on the landscape or townscape. It is anticipated that other constraints identified could be subject to suitable mitigation measures.

POST REGULATION 18 UPDATE:

Following a review of the comments received during the Regulation-18 consultation, as well as ongoing discussions with the LLFA have confirmed that the site lies at the head of a surface water flowpath and, if developed in addition to the preferred allocation site SN4036, would have an adverse impact on the flood risk south of the site along School Road. For this reason the LLFA have advised that they are unable to support the allocation of both of these sites and as such SN4036 remains the preferred site for allocation. However, the site remains as a REASONABLE option as it may be a reasonable alternative should the preferred site not progress within the VCHAP.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 17 June 2020

Date Updated: 28 April 2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4069SL
Site address	Land south of Scole Road, Brockdish
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	There have been a number of historic refusals for residential development, the most recent dismissed on appeal (2006/1596)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.18 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – 2 to 3 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	16dph (4 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Established access suitable for minor residential development.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Green. No acceptable walking route to catchment school at Harleston</p> <p>Highways Meeting - Would provide an extension to the built form. No safe walking route to school (which is 6km away). Highways would have no issues with SL extension for 2 dwellings, subject to adequate visibility and access</p>	Green
<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 	Amber	<p>Harleston Primary School is 6km away</p> <p>Bus service passes site with bus stops within 100 metres</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		Distance to Brockdish village hall 100 metres Distance to The Old Kings Head public house 360 metres	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but unsure about sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues. NCC Minerals – site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Surface water flood risk on highway past site.</p> <p>LLFA – Green.</p> <p>Surface water flooding. Site adjacent to significant flooding (flowpath). Must be considered when doing a site assessment. Standard information required.</p>	Amber

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>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Site is in protected river valley landscape. No loss of high-grade agricultural land.</p> <p>SDC Landscape Officer - Acceptable in landscape terms</p>	Amber
Townscape	Green	<p>Would continue existing pattern of development.</p> <p>SDC Heritage Officer - no heritage objection to SN4069. During the Conservation Area Appraisal consultation for Brockdish a couple of years ago there was concern at removing the corner area of housing (chalet bungalows) from the CA and that this was somehow connected to allowing this site to be developed in future. However, I can see no heritage reasons why it couldn't be and the</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Conservation Area remains on the north side so its setting will still be taken into account.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Site to south-east NCC Ecology - Green. Potential for protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain. Close to Brockdish Common and Adj. Meadow CWS and Registered Common.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	In conservation area and opposite Grade II listed building. SDC Heritage Officer - no heritage objection to SN4069. During the conservation area appraisal consultation for Brockdish a couple of years ago there was concern at removing the corner area of housing (chalet bungalows) from the CA and that this was somehow connected to allowing this site to be developed in future. However, I can see no heritage reasons why it couldn't be and the conservation area remains on the north side so its setting will still be taken into account. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Road is of a reasonable standard with footway. NCC Highways - Red. No acceptable walking route to catchment school at Harleston. Highways Meeting - Would provide an extension to the built form. No safe walking route to school (which is 6km away). Highways would have no issues with SL extension for 2 dwellings, subject to adequate visibility and access	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	A small development of one or two dwellings could potentially be accommodated on this site without having an adverse impact on the historic environment or townscape	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access which should be satisfactory for minor residential development	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to east and on opposite side of Scole Road to north	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Domestic fencing with hedging on eastern boundary	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Evergreen hedging on highway boundary, other bushes and trees on other boundaries	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 on site	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views are limited into site other than through access	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>Potential for a small additional amount of development through a settlement limit extension</p>	<p>Green</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)
River Valley		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	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?	Site is in single private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately/Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		

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 form 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)	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Affordable housing would not be required	n/a
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size for a settlement limit extension.

Site Visit Observations

Site is well contained visually but even if evergreen hedging were to be removed there is potential for site to accommodate one or two dwellings in the context of the existing pattern of development.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Brockdish. The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

REASONABLE for extension to settlement limit. The site is adjacent to the settlement limit, and although it is 6k to the primary school it does have access to other facilities. It is in the main part of the village and would be an extension to the built form respecting the existing pattern of development with only a very localised and limited impact on the river valley and Conservation Area. There is an existing access and any loss of Leylandii along the frontage would not be detrimental.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST REGULATION-18 CONSULTATION:

Ongoing discussions with the LLFA have raised concerns about the impact development of this site could have on an existing, active off-site surface water flowpath. As such the site has been reviewed and is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for extension to the settlement limit.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 23 December 2020

Date Updated: : 11 May 2022

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, Brooke
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 (i) Allocated site (j) 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) <p>Brooke Cricket Club - 1,150m</p>	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 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

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4014
Site address	Land to east of Common Road and south of Beccles Road, Burgh St Peter
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.96 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation – minimum 12 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 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	Access options are constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Green No feasible safe walking route to school.	Green
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	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School over 5km Bus service runs past site	Red

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 		Distance to Burgh St Peter village hall 550 metres Distance to White Lion public house 100 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available AW advise sewers crossing this site	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified surface water flood risk within small areas of site	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 with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Woodland contributes to local landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Site would be detached from other residential areas of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Site consists of an area of woodland NCC Ecology - Amber SSSI IRZ. Land is Priority Habitat - Deciduous woodland. Loss of woodland would lead to fragmentation	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red No feasible safe walking route to school. No feasible safe walking route to school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Commercial uses to south of site	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Poor relationship with existing areas of residential development	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access may be achievable into site, although likely to involve felling of trees. Pedestrian access is poor.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Area of woodland. No demolition issues and no redevelopment issues other than extensive felling of trees	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Commercial uses to south of site which may result in compatibility issues and would need to be considered further.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees which form part of woodland on boundary	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site is wooded with plenty of habitat potential	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 site are limited due to its wooded nature	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>Not suitable due to loss of woodland as well as distance from primary school</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)
		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?	Site is in private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		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 form 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)	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated. Highways, landscape and ecology constraints have been identified. Consideration needs to be given towards the neighbouring commercial use.

Site Visit Observations

Site is wooded which positively contributes to character of area and to local landscape. Site is also remote from many services, including primary school.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but close to development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints have been identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an unreasonable option for development due to being heavily constrained by mature tree cover, which has been identified as 'Priority Habitat - Deciduous woodland'. The loss of the woodland could lead to fragmentation. The site is also at the limits of accessibility to services in terms of distance, a problem which is exacerbated by the lack of footways. Development would have needed to respect the linear pattern of existing development to the north, otherwise it would have an urbanising effect on this rural location. This would mean that the site would be restricted to frontage development, where there is limited developable land due to surface water flood risk and tree cover.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 5 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0078
Site address	Land off Loddon Road, Ditchingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.74
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25 dph (Approximately 19 dwellings)
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>Access to the site is proposed from Loddon Road. Subject to appropriate visibility splays the access is considered acceptable</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - developer would need to demonstrate adequate visibility could be achieved, as well as a pedestrian footpath along the site frontage; it may also be necessary to investigate junction improvements at the Station Road/ Loddon Road/ Hollow Hill Road junction if estate scale development is proposed on the site.</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>Primary School within Ditchingham is approximately 750m away</p> <p>Village shop</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities</p> <p>Regular bus services operate between Diss and Beccles.</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>2 public houses</p> <p>Village Hall</p> <p>2 pre-school facilities – Ditchingham and Broome Pre-school within development boundary and Ditchingham Day Nursery outside of the development boundary in Belsey Bridge Road.</p> <p>Recreation ground within Ditchingham</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises that water, foul drainage, electricity and gas are available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues</p> <p>Minerals & Waste – the site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site</p>	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		progresses as an allocation then 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, it should be included within any allocation policy.	
Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1	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>)		Waveney River Valley Site is grade 3 agricultural land	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is within the river valley, however this covers all the land outside the development boundary in Ditchingham	Amber
Townscape	Green	Site is surrounded by existing built development Comments of the Senior Heritage & Conservation Officer post Reg-18 consultation - No issues - some concerns about how a successful site could be developed taking into account the unusual shape of the site and tree constraints from the adjacent site (overhang, roots etc)	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development of the site may result in the loss of trees on the site Comments of the Landscape Officer	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		post Reg-18 consultation - adjacent site is Priority Habitat (deciduous woodland) and this extends partially into the promoted site - tree protection measures would need to be considered - constraints to be taken into consideration; scope for some potential development on the site; tree survey would be required to determine species etc and developable area of the site.	
Historic Environment	Amber	Site is not considered to impact upon the historic environment HES score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	The site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Site is accessible via Loddon Road Highways score – Amber	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be achieved from Loddon Road	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential curtilage	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site slopes downwards from Loddon Road.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	The site is screened from wider views due to existing vegetation	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 within the site which would need to be removed to enable development. Additional trees overhang the site from the neighbouring plot.	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)	There is residential development within close proximity which suggests that utilities would be available.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are limited views into the site due to the existing tree cover.	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>Development on the site would require the removal of a number of trees.</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		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. Applicant is the part owner of the site. It is not clear whether the other land owners wish to see the site developed.	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Site is not being actively marketed, however the landowner has previously been approached by a local house builder to develop the site.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	
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)	Applicant has provided a statement setting out that they consider it to be deliverable.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	No	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Applicant has confirmed that the site is viable and policy requirements could be met	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable due to potential adverse impact upon landscape/townscape.

Site Visit Observations

The site contains a number of trees, which provide part of the verdant setting to this section of Loddon Road. Development on the site would result in loss of trees which would impact upon the landscape/townscape in this area.

Local Plan Designations

Site is located within the designated river valley, however this is the same for all sites within Ditchingham and Broome.

Availability

Applicant is the part owner of the site. Details of the other site owners have not been provided, furthermore they have not confirmed whether they would be willing for the site to be development.

Achievability

The achievability of the site is queried if all landowners are not willing to develop the site. It is also unclear what parts of the site are outside of the ownership of the promoter.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

UNREASONABLE – The development of the site would require the removal of a number of trees. Development would impact upon the landscape. Furthermore, the site is in multiple ownership and it is unclear if all the site owners support development

Update post Regulation 18 consultation: Representations were submitted in response to the Regulation 18 consultation advising of the low value of the trees that remain on the site. A further review of the tree coverage has identified Priority Habitat (deciduous woodland) on the adjacent site, partially extending to SN0078. The tree coverage is considered to be a constraint to development of this site but with appropriate design solutions some form of development on the site may be achievable. The Highways Authority have indicated that off-site highway works, including potential junction improvements, would be required to make this site acceptable in highways terms. The site is considered to be a REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 13 July 2020

Date Updated: 3 May 2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0345
Site address	Land to the north of Loddon Road, Ditchingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.62 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph = approximately 40 dwellings
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>Access proposed via Loddon Road, consideration would be needed of visibility splays.</p> <p>Highways score – Amber – the developer would need to widen carriageway to 5.5m and provide a 2.0m footway to connect with existing to west</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - Need to check whether report has been forwarded and send through if not; development on this site would result in the loss of trees along the site frontage</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 	Green	<p>Primary School within Ditchingham is approximately 250metres from the site.</p> <p>Village shop</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities</p> <p>Regular bus services operate between Diss and Beccles.</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>2 public houses</p> <p>Village Hall</p> <p>2 pre-school facilities – Ditchingham and Broome Pre-school within development boundary and Ditchingham Day Nursery outside of the development boundary in Belsey Bridge Road.</p> <p>Recreation ground within Ditchingham</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises that water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues</p> <p>Minerals & Waste comment – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		becomes an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	
Flood Risk	Amber	Site is in flood zone 1	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>		Waveney River Valley Site is grade 3 agricultural land	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is currently screened from public view by existing hedgerows and trees.	Amber
Townscape	Green	There is existing residential development to the south of the site. Site is contained within the landscape due to existing screening. Senior Heritage & Conservation Officer - Green	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Access via Loddon Road would involve the loss of some hedgerows fronting the road.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Site is not considered to impact upon the historic environment Senior Heritage & Conservation Officer - Green HES score – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Site would not result in the loss of open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Site is accessible from Loddon Road. Additional footpaths would be needed to connect to existing provision. Development is not considered to impact upon the functioning of the local road network, subject to improvements to the footpaths.</p> <p>Highways score – Amber. The developer would need to widen carriageway to 5.5m and provide a 2.0m footway to connect with existing to west</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development is not considered to impact the historic environment. The site is screened from the wider landscape and is not considered to have an adverse impact upon the townscape.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	There is an existing field access from Loddon Road. Highways authority should advise on visibility splays if the site is considered to be a potential Reasonable Alternative site as there is the potential this would affect trees.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential dwellings are located to the west and north of the site.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site slopes up to the north west	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	There are existing trees which screen the site from the south, east and north. There is an open boundary to the residential dwelling to the north	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	There is an existing access to the site, which subject to confirmation from NCC would be suitable, however to create visibility splays and provide to connect to the exiting provision to the west this may result in the loss of trees. This should be clarified.	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	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	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 the site are restricted by the existing trees on the site boundary. Within the site there is an open view of the residential dwellings to the west	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)	Subject to clarifications in regard to the point of access, visibility splays and impact upon trees, site is considered a suitable option for development.	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		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	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Site isn't currently being marketed	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	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)	Promoter has confirmed deliverability	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Improvements required to the footpath to provide connection to the existing provision to the west	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considered to be a suitable option for residential development, subject to clarification in regard to the access and visibility splays in regard to trees which border the site. A footpath would also need to be provided to connect to the existing provision to the west.

Site Visit Observations

The site is screened from the wider landscape. There is an existing field access from Loddon Road, located to the west of the site. Clarification is needed from Highways and the Landscape Architect in regard to the access and impact upon trees.

Local Plan Designations

Site is located within the River Valley, however this is the same for all sites within Ditchingham

Availability

The landowner has confirmed that the site is available. No additional constraints have been identified.

Achievability

An off-site footpath connection would be needed to connect with the existing provision to the west.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE – This site is considered to suitable for allocation, subject to confirmation of highway suitability and provision of a footway. The site relates suitably to existing services and facilities, the existing form and character of the village and there is limited impact on the wider landscape due to existing screening.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 13 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0218
Site address	Land west of Earsham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.46 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocation of 80 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified
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>Access to the south via The Street (good visibility)</p> <p>Potential constraints on access from hedgerow. Lack of footway immediately adjoining site.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS -Amber Subject to access at south eastern boundary and frontage development. Will require speed limit to be extended and review of speed reducing feature/entry treatment, including existing feature. Footway required at frontage and north eastwards within highway to connect with existing facilities, including crossing facility to connect with ex facility to south east side of The Street. Improve footway at south east side of The Street for its full length south of Milestone Lane to School Road, may need to use some of existing carriageway. Particular pinch between 22 The Street and Old Ale House needs to be resolved.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Highways meeting – Long site frontage, so providing a suitable vehicular access should not be a problem (good visibility/ability to set development back to provide a footway). However limited verge to provide a footway from the site to the village. This is the old A143 pre-bypass, and measures to reinforce the 30mph limit may be needed. Key issue remains the creation of a footpath back to the village	
<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>Distance to Earsham Primary School 600 metres along roads with footways (other than immediately adjoining site). Slightly shorter route available through footpath link to Queensway</p> <p>Village 2 buses per day either going to Great Yarmouth or to Diss Nearest bus stop located 150meters from the site, along The Street</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>Distance to village hall 220 metres</p> <p>Distance to playing field 630 metres</p> <p>Distance to The Queens Head public house 200 metres</p> <p>Local employment: care home, small retail businesses</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Capacity tbc AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Access to all key services, except for gas supply. Electricity lines cross the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Flood Zone 1. Small section to the southern boundary is considered a 'low risk' to surface flooding.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified surface water flood risk on site F & W - Few or no Constraints. Small area of ponding in the 1:1000 year rainfall events as shown in the Environment Agency's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. Watercourse not apparent (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). Not served by AW connection.	Amber

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>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley ALC: Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER Acceptable in landscape character terms however the importance of the hedgerow along the site frontage would need to be confirmed	Amber
Townscape	Green	Site is well related to existing development in the village	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES – Amber SNC HERITAGE OFFICER – seems fine in Townscape and Heritage terms. A143 is quite well landscaped on south side. There are some views towards the church spire – however these are less important than views from the Waveney Valley to the east	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	No footway along this section of road. Road is of reasonable capacity and offers relatively direct access to A143 NCC HIGHWAYS -Amber	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site could relate well to the existing settlement and is contained in the wider landscape by the A143	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable, but footway link will need to be provided along road into village to connect to existing footway. This appears to be achievable.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Boundary with A143 could require noise mitigation measures. Otherwise residential properties or agricultural land with no compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is relatively level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow along boundary with The Street / Harleston Road. Belt of trees planted on most of A143 boundary. Otherwise largely open	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries.	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)	Two overhead power lines bisect site	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views from A143 as approach site from west and also from Harleston Road	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>Part of site adjacent to village could be suitable for allocation for 25 dwellings subject to footway being able to be provided.</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)
River Valley		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation.	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?	Site is in private 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?	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:	The land is currently subject to an Agricultural Tenancy, but possession can be obtained.	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 form 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)	Will require speed limit to be extended and review of speed reducing feature/entry treatment, including existing feature. Footway required at frontage and north eastwards within highway to connect with existing facilities, including crossing facility to connect with existing facility to south east side of The Street and improvements to footway within village	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Landowner has acknowledged that there are likely to be policy requirements such as affordable housing provision. Confirmed site to still be viable for proposed use taking into account the policy requirements and CIL.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Affordable housing provision and open space	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site as promoted is too large for an allocation of 12 to 25 dwellings. However, it could be reduced in size. The site is well related to the existing settlement of Earsham and is well linked as it is bounded by the A143 to the north.

Site Visit Observations

Large field adjacent to built up area of village that is severed from the wider landscape by the A143. There is an existing passing place to the south of the site which restricts the speed into the village from the east. There is a 3-wire power cable line which runs across the site. The site appears open within the countryside as views in and out of the site are currently unscreened.

Local Plan Designations

The site is well related to the existing settlement of Earsham and is well linked as it is bounded by the A143 to the north. Outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Earsham.

Availability

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

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

This site was preferred for allocation on the basis that the site is well related to Earsham village and facilities. Development of the site is subject to achieving a satisfactory access to the south eastern boundary, off The Street. The site benefits from a long site frontage where providing a suitable vehicular access should be sufficient (good visibility/ability to set development back to provide a footway). Whilst development of the site may have impacts upon the landscape and townscape, it has been identified that these could be mitigated. The site is within Flood Zone 1 where a small section to the southern boundary is considered a 'low risk' to surface flooding, given the size of the site it is considered that development is still achievable.

POST REGULATION 18 UPDATE: Following a review of the comments received during the Regulation-18 consultation, as well as ongoing discussions with technical consultees, the status of site SN0218 has been reviewed and the site has been reclassified as a reasonable alternative (shortlisted). On balance the visual impact arising from the development of this site will have both a landscape and townscape impact, particularly when viewed from the A143. In addition, an updated submission on an alternative site within Earsham (SN0390REVA) has resulted in that site becoming a preferable site for delivering an allocation within this settlement with fewer impacts arising.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 14 January 2021
Date Updated: 29 April 2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1015
Site address	Land adjacent to the primary school, The Street, Hempnall
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.6 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approx. 19 dwellings = 12 dph (25 dph = 40 dwellings)
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>Existing access from The Street, Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS - May not be able to achieve acceptable visibility. 2,0m wide footway required at frontage along with carriageway widening to 5.5m minimum. Highway constrained in vicinity of site.</p> <p>Updated comments - would be preferable in highways terms (by a considerable margin), adjacent to the new vehicular access for the primary school.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Adjacent to primary school Doctor surgery, local retail and employment opportunities within 1800m Peak bus service (on bus route)	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Community centre, recreation ground and village groups within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has not advised services to site. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified in western section and close to existing access	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>		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design SNC Landscape officer: significant levels changes across the site which currently serves as the access to the primary school	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts on form and character of settlement. Impacts may be limited by reduced site area.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of Has to south and west and on character of CA. Impact may be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential/education/vacant land	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Views from the conservation area in this landscape gap of open countryside. Any development should be lower density to maintain some through views. Impact on character of CA and setting of HAs should be assessed	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access from The Street. Possibility of access to northern part of site from Old Market Way but check ownership - ransom strip? Already highway congestion along The Street. NCC to confirm feasibility	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture/unused/ 2 dwellings at northern end of site	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential development to west and south, education to east. Agriculture to north - compatible	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Ground level rises to north. There is embankment/earthwork within the site which creates an obstacle to development/road layout	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow/fencing. Open to north. PRoW close to NE site boundary.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees within existing hedgerows	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)	Crossing northern part of site	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	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	Open in views from north and prominent in views from The Street	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)	Very accessible to local services and public transport. However, a complicated site with significant changes in ground level. Heritage and flood risk issues and congestion of existing highway network	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	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)	None	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		

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 statement from promoter addressing traffic, heritage and landscape	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Land for expansion of primary school	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considered a suitable size for allocation. It has been noted that there are potential issues with Heritage, highways and flood risk. Significant changes in levels could also constrain development.

Site Visit Observations

Very accessible to local services and public transport. However, a complicated site with significant changes in ground level. Heritage and flood risk issues and congestion of existing highway network.

Local Plan Designations

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a **REASONABLE** option for development. The site benefits from good connectivity and relates well to the existing built form of the settlement. The site is relatively open to the north with a PRow to the north east site boundary, where development should be lower density to maintain some through views and to reduce impact on the character of the Conservation Area and setting of the Listed Buildings. Off-site highway works have been identified however these are considered to be achievable. Development would also need to address change in levels across the site.

POST REGULATION 18 UPDATE:

Technical consultee comments submitted by the Lead Local Flood Authority in response to the Regulation 18 consultation highlighted that part of the on-site flood risk contributes to an adjacent flow path where the flow lines indicate this flood water flows southeast off the site, contributing to a larger flow path southwest and south of the site. As a result this site and the previously noted impact on the conservation area and listed building, the site has been reassessed and whilst it is still considered to be a REASONABLE site for development, its status has now been changed from preferred to shortlisted.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 21 August 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0348
Site address	Land to the South of Old Yarmouth Road, Kirby Row, Kirby Cane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No recent planning history (historic refusals for residential development)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.65ha
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for approximately 20 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approximately 20 dwellings which equates to 31dph 16 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>No existing access from highway to the site. Initial highway comments indicate that there may be potential constraints on the site but these could be overcome. Off-site highway improvements would be required including provision of footpath.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. May be feasible to form access subject to adequate visibility being available, provision of frontage 2.0m wide footway and modification to existing speed limit. Visibility north from Old Yarmouth Rd to Church Rd constrained, little scope for improvement.</p> <p><i>(Highways meeting: would appear broadly acceptable in highways terms, main concern would be visibility re the speed of traffic exiting the bypass from the north, but there appears to be scope to realign the carriageways within the existing highways)</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 	Green	<p>Village Shop within 500m</p> <p>Nearest bus stop is 255m is 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston.</p> <p>Primary School is within 1800m</p> <p>No footpath on Mill Lane but from Mill Road there is a footpath all the way to the school.</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</p> <p>Recreational ground</p> <p>Public House</p> <p>All with 1800m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>Desktop investigations in relation to contamination have been undertaken and no issues found. No known ground stability issues</p> <p>NCC M&W – the site is less than 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If the site</p>	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		progresses 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.	
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood zone 1. Surface water flooding 1-100 in the top northwest corner and 1-1000 across the site from west to south and east covers about 50%.</p> <p>LLFA – Significant mitigation measures required for heavy constraints. A flow path present in the 1:1000 year rainfall events as identified on the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps, runs from North West to South East crossing the site. Watercourse is not apparent on DRN mapping (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). Safe dry, emergency access and egress across the site should also be considered. Not served by AW connection. In SPZ2 for groundwater protection so will need to be considered when designing SUDS.</p>	Amber

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>		<p>A5 Waveney Rural River Valley</p> <p>ALC – Grade 3</p>	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on landscape. Consideration needs to be given to the proximity to the Broads. SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER - Potentially acceptable in landscape terms as it could retain the setting of the settlement.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development could have a detrimental impact on townscape but it is considered that this could be mitigated. Density considerations? SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated. SSSI Leeth Hill to the east of the site 700m. With 3000m of the Ramsar site located southeast - south of Gillingham Road, Geldeston.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed building to the southwest of the site but is separated by existing development SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on functioning of local road network, that may not be reasonably mitigated. NCC to confirm. NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. May be feasible to form access subject to adequate visibility being available, provision of frontage 2.0m wide footway and modification to existing speed limit. Visibility north from Old Yarmouth Rd to Church Rd constrained, little scope for improvement.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<i>(Highways meeting: would appear broadly acceptable in highways terms, main concern would be visibility re the speed of traffic exiting the bypass from the north, but there appears to be scope to realign the carriageways within the existing highways)</i>	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The listed building to the south is separated by intervening land uses. Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The site is adjacent to the development boundary. This part of the village is characterised by a linear form either side of Church Road. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. Noted that the Broads Authority is located to the south of this part of village.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on road network.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural/residential	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Residential boundaries to the west mixture of fencing and hedges, open to the north and south	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated. Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).	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)	Overhead lines along the site frontage	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from Old Yarmouth Road when viewed from the north and east. Sensitive landscape as it is in the River Valley.	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)	Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the northeast of the village. The site is open and visible in long views across the landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm could be difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley.	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)
Designated River Valley		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	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	Green
Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Likely off-site highway improvements. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation and relates reasonably well to the existing settlement. The site is well connected to local services and could be enhanced to create a gateway to the village. Development of the site would be constrained by identified areas of surface water flooding and access arrangements for the site would also require careful consideration. Updated highways comments suggest that there may be scope for addressing the earlier highway safety concerns identified.

Site Visit Observations

Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the northeast of the village. The site is open and visible in long views across the landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley, however it could also be a gateway site.

Local Plan Designations

River valley setting.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

Surface water flooding across the site may affect both the viability and/ or quantum of development that is achievable on the site.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a REASONABLE option for allocation at this stage, subject to further discussions with the LLFA about the identified flood risk across the site and the mitigation measures that would be required to address this. Updated highways comments identify possible solutions to earlier highway safety concerns and whilst there would be a landscape impact to development in this location it could also provide an opportunity to enhance a gateway approach to the settlement.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST REGULATION-18 CONSULTATION:

Following the Regulation 18 consultation, and in response to the comments of the LLFA, this site has been reviewed for inclusion in the VCHAP and is now considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for development. Significant surface water and drainage constraints have been identified on the site and whilst the Council has made efforts to engage with the promoter of the site to seek a possible solution to these issues this has not been met with a response. For these reasons the site is no longer considered to be an available or achievable site for allocation.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 11 August 2020
Date Updated: 10 May 2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4052
Site address	Land south of School Lane and east of Manor Farm Barns, Little Melton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	Allocation – 25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 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>Possibility of creating a suitable access is constrained.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to acceptable visibility at access. School Lane appears narrow with no f/w poor vis at junction with Green Lane.</p>	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 	Amber	<p>Distance to Little Melton Primary School 650 metres, mainly with footways but no footway along section of School Lane east of junction with Green Lane</p> <p>Distance to bus service 180 metres</p> <p>Distance to shop 350 metres</p> <p>Local employment 1.8km</p>	

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 		Distance to Little Melton village hall and recreation ground 1.6km Distance to The Village Inn public house 600 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewerage infrastructure will need to be upgraded AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface water flood risk along highway	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>		C1 Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	In Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone. No loss of high grade agricultural land. SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER- Within the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone which has a policy requirement to retain openness. Well screened. SN4052 is more open within the landscape but does not have any significant arboricultural issues.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Other than barn complex to west there is no existing development on the southern side of this section of School Lane	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Manor Farm Barns to west can be considered a non-designated heritage asset. NCC HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained NCC HIGHWAYS - Red	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would introduce new development on to the southern side of School Lane and potentially have an adverse impact on heritage assets to the west	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No Highways comments, however likely to be similar to SN0488 where access may be achievable, but would need footway provision along School Lane. NCC Highways also state that carriageway realignment may be requirement	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Manor Farm Barns to west has been converted to residential use and there are residential properties on the other side of School Lane to the north. Otherwise agricultural land. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Land rises to the south	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Some hedging along highway boundary with a couple of large trees. Other boundaries are undefined as part of larger field.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on boundary	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

Site Visit Observations	Comments	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 across site from School Lane	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)	Possible site for development, depending on access being achievable and subject to the views of the Senior Heritage and Design Officer	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone	Siter is entirely within the zone	
Conclusion	Development of the site would conflict with the aspirations of the policy protecting the Bypass Landscape Protection Zone	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?	Site is in private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately/Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		

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 form 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)	Footway provision along School Lane and possible carriageway realignment	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Additional land available to be given to the parish council or other local body for community use as open space / recreation / woodland / orchard / allotments	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated, subject to achieving satisfactory access. Highway and heritage constraints have been identified. The site is also located within the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone which seeks to protect openness.

Site Visit Observations

School Lane is a constrained road that has been severed by the A47 and does not have the benefit of footways. Development consists of limited frontage development in a linear pattern along the north side of the road. Development of this would therefore introduce development on to an undeveloped side of the road. It would be adjacent to a converted barn complex to the west, but this may have setting of heritage asset implications.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary. The site is entirely within the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered a **REASONABLE** option for allocation.

The site is located to the south of School Lane where there are reasonable verges but no footways, the road would need to be widened and include footpaths. It would also need to be demonstrated that sufficient visibility splays can be achieved, prior to accepting development is acceptable. Whilst the site is located within a residential context, located to the west is Manor Farm Barns which is considered a non-designated heritage asset, the impact of the setting would need to be considered. In landscape terms, the site is relatively open where the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone seeks to protect openness. The site does not have any significant arboricultural issues.

POST REGULATION 18 UPDATE: Technical consultee comments submitted by the Lead Local Flood Authority in response to the Regulation 18 consultation highlighted potential issues with areas of flood risk located within the site access, which is not considered to be suitable. In addition, through the Regulation 18 consultation 2 new sites were submitted within Little Melton and these were considered to be preferable options due to their central location and fewer constraints. As such, the site has now been shortlisted as a reason alternative.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 30 November 2020

Date Updated: 3 May 2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0418
Site address	Land at Cook's Field, n/o Jocelyn Close, Pulham Market
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.66 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension	Promoted for allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	22.7 dph (indicative layout submitted) (approximately 15 dwellings)
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>There are potential access constraints - narrow lane with shallow verges. NCC to confirm that adequate visibility achievable.</p> <p>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - narrow road network and problem junction to the south (Bank Street/ Tattlepot Rd); small scale development may be hard to object to but junction is blind and really very poor; remain concerned about smaller scale development; unlikely to be able to widen the road on the correct side of the road and would require loss of mature tree</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 	Green	<p>Primary school approx. 1km walking route (no footpath for 90m).</p> <p>GP surgery</p> <p>Limited retail in settlement but includes builders merchants. Farm shop & garden centre nearby but remote from settlement.</p> <p>Employment opportunities within settlement</p> <p>2 bus operators run daytime services daily between settlement and Norwich (including peak time)</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</p> <p>2 public houses within settlement</p> <p>2 cafes in farm/garden centres which are remote from settlement</p> <p>Pre-school in village hall</p> <p>Site close to recreation ground</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1 but identified flood risk along Mill Lane which would need to be considered. Wide ditch in verge along highway boundary.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		E4: Great Moulton Plateau ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site visually contained in views from north and wider views from east however the site is of significant size	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would represent a breakout to north but a reduced scale and visual containment of site would limit its impact. Senior Conservation & Design Officer – Green. Straightforward extension of settlement, however starting to get quite far out from centre, in what is quite a clustered village.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Ecology report submitted. Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development would not have detrimental impact on designated heritage assets Senior Conservation & Design Officer - Green HES score – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Narrow land with shallow verges. NCC to confirm where sufficient for increased capacity CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Very well separated from heritage assets to east. Unlikely to impact on character or setting subject to boundary treatments and overall heights. A reduced scale would reduce the townscape impact.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access at southern end. Narrow lane (observed that two vehicles cannot pass without mounting narrow verge). NCC to confirm if adequate for increased capacity and off-site improvements needed.	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)	Compatible - residential to south Agriculture	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)	Hedgerow to N, S & W. Open to larger parcel of farmland on E side	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Continuous hedgerow to N, W & S. No significant trees. Wide ditch between hedge and road frontage	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views along Mill Lane in both directions. Part of larger parcel which is then visually contained	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>Development would represent limited breakout to north but would be contained from wider views. Consider suitable for allocation subject to mitigation of constraints</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	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Not to knowledge of promoter	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green
Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Limited off-site highway improvements may be required. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Footpath link to recreation ground is offered	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Promoted site is of significant size but could be reduced in scale and number reducing its impact within the landscape and on the townscape. Possible highways issues identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site on edge of settlement but within reach of services, subject to provision of footpath link to existing at Jocelyn Close. Site visible from road but wider landscape impacts could be mitigated. Overall, limited constraints and site likely to be acceptable, subject to clarifications as listed.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and adjacent to development boundary; no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified.

Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered reasonable for an allocation of up to 15 dwellings, subject to highways considerations and landscape mitigation. Highways have raised concerns about the potential to form an acceptable access and the suitability of the local highway network. The site is not likely to be suitable for development at higher densities than promoted due to edge of settlement location.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 5 June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0405
Site address	Land to North and South of Brooke Road, Seething
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	The 'Cart Shed' site: L/5630 Two dwellings for farm workers. Approved 1978/0535 Two Dwellings Together with Garages and Stores for Farm Workers. Approved 1985/2380 Conversion of Redundant Cart Shed and Store to A Single Dwelling for Private Use. Refused 2004/2367 Proposed conversion of barn to single dwelling. Approved
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.252ha (total of 3 sites) Site North of Brooke Road 0.772ha – 19 dwellings The site 'The Cart Shed' – 7 dwellings The site between Seething and Mundham School and Church Farmhouse will provide additional car parking for the school
Promoted Site Use, including (aa) Allocated site (bb) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Residential development of approximately 26 dwellings (as well as additional car parking for the adjoining school)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield and part of the barn conversions garden

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
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>Potential access constraints existing hedge/trees to site frontage. Potential access could be formed to the land to the north, subject to a frontage footway. Adoptable access unlikely to be achieved to the south area. The road bends and has the school access and other junctions in close proximity</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber, access could be formed to the area north of Brooke Road subject to frontage footway. Adoptable standard access unlikely to be achievable to the area south of Brooke Road. Does not appear feasible to provide footway to nearby school.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting - very tight to get a footway on the School Road/Brooke Road junction (particularly with the pond on the corner). School access is currently arranged to separate vehicles and pedestrians, with vehicle access from Brooke Road and pedestrians</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		from School Road. Likely to need a discussion with both the site promoter and the school about enhanced access arrangements and car parking, maybe accessing the school at the western end. Layout of the road means that speed limit compliance is likely to be good in this location, and a part-time 20mph outside the school may be beneficial.	
<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>Village Shop 575m</p> <p>Bus stop within 594m and is on the bus route for Anglian 86</p> <p>Primary School is within 122m</p> <p>No footpaths</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 604m</p> <p>Recreational ground/play area next to village hall</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, sewage, gas and electricity available to site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1 with surface water flooding depth of 1-1000 in the road and around the pond	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>)		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may be reasonably mitigated. Landscape Meeting - Particular concerns about the infilling of the 'Old Park' site as this would represent significant infill which could have a townscape impact. Consider this to be a difficult site however further consideration of this site is required.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The sites are located in a distinctly rural part of the District on the edge of Seething. Existing buildings in the wider context are of mixed architectural character incorporating a range of materials and styles, with village ponds also a feature. The grain in Seething is generally quite spacious especially the more peripheral areas and vegetation remains quite dominant along the streets, and relatively few buildings are located close to the back of the street except more toward the centre, but even	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>there hedgerows are a key feature.</p> <p>The cart shed site is located within/adjacent to a farm complex and the land to the north of the is located adjacent to a linear form of development to the east and an estate to the west.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. The land north of Brooke Road is adjacent to the development boundary to the southeast.</p>	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB. St Margaret's Church is located to the east of School lane. Separated from the two housing sites by intervening land uses. Seething Old hall and Church Monument are located to the northwest of the 'land to north of Brooke Road' with the Seething Old Hall Park development between. The Cart Shed site is located within the Seething Conservation Area. The 'land to north of Brooke Road' is partly within and as is small part of the land proposed for parking.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on functioning of road network which may not be reasonably mitigated. Narrow carriage way and no footway</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, access could be formed to the area north of Brooke</p>	<p>Red</p> <p>Amber</p>

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>Road subject to frontage footway. Adoptable standard access unlikely to be achievable to the area south of Brooke Road. Does not appear feasible to provide footway to nearby school.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting - very tight to get a footway on the School Road/Brooke Road junction (particularly with the pond on the corner). School access is currently arranged to separate vehicles and pedestrians, with vehicle access from Brooke Road and pedestrians from School Road. Likely to need a discussion with both the site promoter and the school about enhanced access arrangements and car parking, maybe accessing the school at the western end. Layout of the road means that speed limit compliance is likely to be good in this location, and a part-time 20mph outside the school may be beneficial.</p>	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential and Seething and Mundham Primary School	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB's.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. The land north of Brooke Road is adjacent to the development boundary to the southeast.</p>	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	<p>Potential access constraints existing hedge/trees to site frontage. Potential access could be formed to the land to the north, subject to a frontage footway. Adoptable access unlikely to be achieved to the south area. The road bends and has the school access and other junctions in close proximity.</p>	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	<p>Part of the Cart Shed site is domestic curtilage to the barn conversion granted consent in 2004. Agricultural grade 3</p>	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	<p>Agricultural/residential and Seething and Mundham Primary School</p>	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	<p>Flat</p>	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	<p>Trees/hedgerows. Residential.</p>	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	<p>Possibly significant trees. As land to north of Brooke Road is agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations.</p> <p>Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc.</p>	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	which could be reasonably mitigated.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	None	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Sites are visible from the road network, The Cart Shed is clearly viewed across the open landscape. The land to the north is better screened. Public footpath runs east west to the south of Church Farmhouse from in front of the school	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)	Land to north is adjacent the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated. Views of the sites are afforded from both the surrounding road network and the and public footpath. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.	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	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	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	Green
Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Likely off-site highway improvements. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Yes - the provision of a car park for the school	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The land to the north of Brooke Road is considered suitable subject to mitigation of constraints and confirmation from NCC Highways that the site is acceptable in highway terms and the heritage officer that the development would not harm the heritage assets, in particular views of the Church and listed building and monument.

Site Visit Observations

Land to north is adjacent the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated. Views of the sites are afforded from both the surrounding road network and the and public footpath. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and adjacent to development boundary in part.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within 5 years

Achievability

No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Three parcels of land have been promoted in this location. Of these two sites are preferred for allocation:

- (1) The land to the north of Brooke Road is considered reasonable subject to mitigation of the constraints particularly the highway impacts, impacts on the existing hedgerow/trees, landscape considerations and heritage terms; and,
- (2) Discussion needs to be undertaken with the school as to whether land between the school and the Church Farm buildings could provide (a) additional car-parking and/or (b) an alternative pedestrian access to the school.

The third parcel of land, 'the cart shed', immediately north of Church Farmhouse is not considered suitable for allocation as this forms part of the setting of a notable non-designated heritage asset within the Conservation Area, contributing significantly to this rural approach to the village.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 4 December 2020

Date Updated: 11 May 2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2031
Site address	Land east of Norwich Road, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2018/1346 – One self-build dwelling - Withdrawn
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.25ha
Promoted Site Use, including (cc) Allocated site (dd) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph (31 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Access is available from Norwich Road.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Amber Subject to widening the frontage footway to 2m. Like to require removal of frontage hedge.</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - Issues with substantial tree and hedge removal and together with SN1057 these form a significant green break between two parts of the village. Forward visibility issues to the south along bend. Junction visibility will be key.</p>	Amber
<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 	Amber	<p>Primary school – 350m from the site</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 			
<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 		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	The promoter has confirmed that there is mains water, sewerage and electricity available to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known ground stability or contamination issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1. A surface water flow path runs along the south of the site. The 1 in 1000 year event extends into the centre of the site significantly reducing the developable area.	Amber

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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1: Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Grade 3 agricultural land. PROW Tacolneston FP9 runs to the south of the site and across the south-eastern corner, connecting to a wider footpath network.</p> <p>There is an existing hedgerow along the front of the site.</p> <p>SNC Landscape Officer - lots of roadside vegetation, including some significant oaks and ash trees; the hedgerow along the roadside has been neglected in recent years; the vegetation provides a green lung between the two groups of development, reinforcing the rural character.</p>	Red
Townscape	Green	Site is well related to other residential development	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>Any impacts of development can be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>A listed building is located to the south of the site. This is set within a reasonable sized plot. Subject to an appropriate design, it is considered that the impact could be mitigated.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Access is from the B1113. There is an existing footpath along the site frontage.	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>NCC Highways – Green. Subject to widening the frontage footway to 2m. Like to require removal of frontage hedge.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Issues with substantial tree and hedge removal and together with SN1057 these form a significant green break between two parts of the village. Forward visibility issues to the south along bend.</p>	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is relatively contained. Listed buildings are located to the south of the site however the impact of the development could be reduced through suitable design solutions.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would be from Norwich Road however would require the removal of trees and hedgerow	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site is generally flat but it slopes towards the southwestern corner.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site is bounded by hedgerows Public footpath is located to the south of the site	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	There are oak trees at the front of the site which support the verdant rural characteristic of this part of Talconeston	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)	A sewerage pumping station is located in the south-eastern corner of the site. This would reduce the developable area of the site. Electricity power lines cross the site	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are restricted by the existing boundary treatments	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>Development of the site would require the loss of significant trees along the western boundary of the site to provide access and suitable visibility splays, this would impact on 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)
		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	No conflicting LP 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?	Immediately	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)	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Improvements to achieve access visibility.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but not provided additional supporting evidence at this time	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site exceeds the objectives of the VCHAP however identified flood risk to the south of the site would reduce the developable area. The site is adjacent to existing built form and relatively well contained. Development of the site would require the loss of significant trees along the western boundary of the site to provide access and suitable visibility splays and this would significantly impact on the landscape.

Site Visit Observations

There is an existing footpath along the front of the site however, to achieve a suitable access a number of trees at the front of the site would need to be removed. This would impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised that the site is available

Achievability

The promoter has advised that the site is achievable however constraints to the size of the site by virtue of the areas of surface water flood risk, the presence of the sewerage pumping station and the overhead electricity power lines have been identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is UNREASONABLE for allocation. Whilst it is well located adjacent to the development boundary access it would have a negative impact on the landscape. It would require the loss of significant trees and hedgerow which create the rural character of this part of Tacolneston and form a significant green break between two parts of the village. There are forward visibility issues to the south along the bend and a surface water flow path runs along the south of the site. These constraints significantly reduce the developable site area.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 25 November 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2103
Site address	Land north of School Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (ee) Allocated site (ff) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 15 dwellings = 17 dph (25 dph = 23 dwellings)
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>Existing field access from School Road. School road narrows to the east at this point. Potential access constraints and loss of frontage hedgerow.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access to site subject to c/w widening to 5.5m and provision of 2.0m f/w at frontage. Surrounding highway network restricted in width, restricted visibility at junctions and lacks footway.</p> <p><i>(Highways meeting: School Road narrows significantly in front of this site. Creating a suitable access would lose all/most of the trees and hedges along the site frontage. Footway link is achievable. Could potentially turn School Road as the primary road into the new development, depending on how much traffic uses School Road beyond the site.)</i></p> <p><i>NCC to confirm whether it has any traffic info which would support turning School Road into site SN2103</i></p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p><i>and making the remainder of School Road beyond the site a side road.</i></p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - if loss of the frontage vegetation is acceptable to facilitate road widening this would address some of the HA concerns (otherwise the site would have a priority road realigned through it which would end in a dead-end which is not a good solution)</p>	
<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>100m walk to primary school</p> <p>Post office within 1800m</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Peak bus service just within 1800m but no footpath provision</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, recreation ground and village groups within 1800m</p> <p>2km walk to PH</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, foul drainage and electricity to site. O/H lines and telegraph poles along southern boundary. No UKPN constraints.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Part of the site lies outside of the proposed fibre installation area. Remainder is under consideration for upgrade	Amber/Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified along highway. LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage.	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>)		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER - Significant loss of trees and hedgerows would be an issue on this site.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be mitigated through design	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Ponds close to eastern boundary. Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of HA to east. Impact could be mitigated.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>HES – Amber</p> <p>SNC Heritage Officer – Amber. Some impact on Elm Tree Farm, but some distance and already a lot of landscape within the curtilage and to side of the LB.</p>	
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>School road narrows significantly here. NCC to confirm if could turn road into site and make remainder of School Road into a side road. Access into site would lose all/most of frontage hedge/trees.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access to site subject to widening to 5.5m and provision of 2.0m f/w at frontage. Surrounding highway network restricted in width, restricted visibility at junctions and lacks f/w.</p> <p><i>(Highways meeting: School Road narrows significantly in front of this site. Creating a suitable access would lose all/most of the trees and hedges along the site frontage. Footway link is achievable. Could potentially turn School Road as the primary road into the new development, depending on how much traffic uses School Road beyond the site.)</i></p> <p><i>NCC to confirm whether it has any traffic info which would support turning School Road into site SN2103, and making the remainder of School Road beyond the site a side road.</i></p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Some impact on Elm Farm to east which would lose more isolated setting. However, well separated and viewed within sizeable curtilage. Retain boundary hedgerow to limit impact.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm if safe access achievable and impact on local network. Any access likely to impact on significant trees on in south western corner. NCC to confirm if access/visibility achievable without removal.	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 to north, residential to other boundaries.	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)	Northern boundary open to farmland. Hedgerow (including some significant trees) to other boundaries.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant boundary trees – assess for TPO. Ponds outside eastern boundary – further investigation required.	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)	O/H lines and telegraph poles on southern boundary.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site visually contained with limited open views from north. Prominent in views along School Road.	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>Site close to primary school and village hall but lack of footpath provision along narrow lanes affects accessibility to other local services. Impacts on townscape, landscape and heritage could all be mitigated through design and landscaping to include retention of eastern boundary hedgerow and limited removal along southern. NCC to confirm if access achievable while retaining significant trees</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
		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)	None	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		

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 statement from promoter	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm if possible to turn School Road into site SN2103, and making the remainder of School Road beyond the site a side road.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Suitable for allocation as it is adjacent to the settlement limits and close to the school. Subject to satisfactory access and retention of significant trees and hedgerow on southern and eastern boundaries.

Site Visit Observations

The site is close to the primary school and village hall but the lack of footpath provision along narrow lanes affects accessibility to other local services. Impacts on townscape, landscape and heritage could all be mitigated through design and landscaping to include retention of eastern boundary hedgerow and limited removal along southern. NCC to confirm if access achievable while retaining significant trees.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Promoter has advised development achievable within 1-3 years.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered REASONABLE. It is located close to the school and village hall and adjacent to the settlement limits. It would read as part of the existing village and is visually contained with limited open views from the north. There would be some impact on Elm Farm to east which would be mitigated if the eastern hedgerow and trees were retained and enhanced. NCC has confirmed that all/most of the frontage hedge/trees would need to be removed to achieve an access into the site. School road narrows to the east at this point and there are potential access constraints; NCC highways to confirm if could turn road into site making this the primary road and make remainder of School Road to the east into a side road.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 1 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0262
Site address	Land north of Church Road, Woodton, NR35 2NB
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated / greenfield
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.055ha
Promoted Site Use, including (gg) Allocated site (hh) SL extension	Allocation (the site has been promoted for 30-36 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	34dph at 36 dwellings 26 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>No existing access but site has road frontage along Church Road and access is likely to be achievable however NCC Highways to confirm. The site is also adjacent to the junction with Norwich Road which may result in highways concerns.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. No access to be via B1332 Norwich Road. Subject to provision of acceptable visibility onto Church Road and demonstration of adequate visibility at Church Road/B1332 junction. Ensure Church Road between the site and B1332 to at least 5.5m Widen existing f/w to 2.0m at site frontage, extend f/w at south side of Church Road westwards to play area access and provide a suitable facility to enable a safe footway crossing away from the junction with B1332 Norwich Road. Widen footway from site to village school.</p> <p><i>(NCC Highways meeting 16/12/20: – a combination of development on [SN0262/SN0268/SN0278] would be</i></p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<i>preferable in highways terms, the junction with the B1332 has been improved, and there is pedestrian access to the school through the new recreation area.)</i>	
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	Local services include primary school, public transport route, play area Primary school – approximately 230m Bus route – adjacent to the site Play area – opposite the site PH & village stores – approximately 890m	
<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 		(see above)	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utilities capacity to be checked	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known infrastructure constraints on the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an area affected by the ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known contamination or ground stability issues NCC M&W – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site proceeds as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Some areas to the east of the site are at risk of flooding but this could be mitigated through design</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Significant ponding present in the 1:30, 1:100 and 1:1000 year rainfall events as identified on the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps in the south east corner the site up to 0.6m in depth. Watercourse not apparent on DRN mapping (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). Surface water mapping is a proxy for flooding from the ordinary watercourse (fluvial not pluvial). Would recommend that development outside areas of flood risk is considered. Not served by AW connection. Access and egress across the site should also be considered</p>	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>		<p>B1 - Tas Tributary Farmland - open landscapes with sporadic settlements and areas of woodland</p> <p>ALC – Grade 3</p>	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have an impact on the landscape due to the open nature of the landscape in this area SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER – would prefer to see linear development on this site combined with SN0268SL.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The site is slightly removed from the main settlement and the closest development is linear in form (as opposed to 'estate-style'). A similar form of design would help mitigate the impact on the townscape	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Note a potential pond on the site to the north-east – potential for impact on biodiversity but this could likely be mitigated NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	LB's to the north and the east of the site. Impact on the farmhouse to the north to be assessed by the Heritage Officer SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Amber. Concerns regarding the setting of the Grade II Manor Farmhouse facing towards the houses. HES – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No impact on the existing open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC Highways previously raised concerns about the potential impact on the highway network. NCC to advise. NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. No access to be via B1332 Norwich Road. Subject to provision of acceptable	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>visibility onto Church Road and demonstration of adequate visibility at Church Road/B1332 junction. Ensure Church Road between the site and B1332 to at least 5.5m Widen existing f/w to 2.0m at site frontage, extend f/w at south side of Church Road westwards to play area access and provide a suitable facility to enable a safe footway crossing away from the junction with B1332 Norwich Road. Widen footway from site to village school.</p> <p><i>(NCC Highways meeting 16/12/20: – a combination of development on these sites would be preferable in highways terms, the junction with the B1332 has been improved, and there is pedestrian access to the school through the new recreation area.)</i></p>	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	To be assessed by the Conservation and Design Officer. LB immediately to the north of the site – this is currently visible in the wider landscape setting. Would suggest that LBs to the east of the site would be less affected by development in this location due to the separation by Norwich Road.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	To be checked with NCC Highways. The site has a road frontage and footway however it is also in close proximity to the junction of Church Road/ Norwich Road which may cause an issue. Also there are some levels differences between the site and the road due to the topography of the site.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Highway/ agricultural/ recreation ground (opposite the site)	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site is undulating and falls to the east (in the area closest to the road junction). This would likely affect development in this location however this area is also the most ecologically sensitive (pond) and the area at risk of surface water flooding	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	There is a small hedgerow along the road frontage and open boundaries to the rear of the promoted site (part of a larger parcel of land)	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	There is a hedgerow along the road frontage but this does not appear to be significant however there is a pond in the north east corner of the site with substantial vegetation surrounding it – this should be subject to an ecological survey if the	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	site is allocated.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Apparatus crosses the western corner of the site – possibly BT apparatus	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 currently prominent in the landscape and affords views to the listed farmhouse to the north however there is development on the opposite side of Norwich Road as well as to the west of the site therefore any residential development in this location would also be viewed in this wider context	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)	Subject to the views of the Conservation & Design Officer and NCC Highways, this would appear to be a reasonable site for development and could be brought forward in conjunction with SN0268SL.	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	There are no conflicting LP 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)	Unknown	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:	The site is currently subject to an agricultural tenancy	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 additional information submitted at this time	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highways improvements to facilitate access into the site; possible off-site highway works to facilitate access to the main areas of the settlement	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes – but no additional information submitted at this time	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of an appropriate size for allocation and subject to highways and heritage issues the site is considered to be suitable for development. The ecological features identified to the north of the site may also need to be assessed.

Site Visit Observations

The site is separated from the centre of the village by the primary school and recreation ground however notwithstanding this it benefits from good connectivity. The existing linear form of development illustrates the form of development that would likely be most acceptable in this location. The greatest sensitivity for this site will be the impact of the development on the setting of the listed building to the north of the site.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

The site is noted as being available within the first years of the plan period, however the site promoter has also noted that the land is currently tenanted.

Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

This site is a reasonable site for allocation, subject to it being demonstrated that there would not be unacceptable impact on the heritage asset to the north. Although separate from the main settlement it benefits from good connectivity and development in this location would be read in the context of the existing dwellings adjacent to the site. It would not have a significant detrimental impact on the wider landscape setting. Impacts on the landscape could be mitigated if this site is developed in conjunction with other sites. Allocation of this site would not need to be reliant on the allocation of SN0268SL although if appropriate they could be combined as a single allocation to the north of Woodton. However, allocation of this site should not be at the density promoted and would need to be similar to the existing linear development adjacent to the site. A combination of development across the sites SN0262, SN0268SL and SN0278 would be preferable in highway terms.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST REGULATION-18 CONSULTATION:

Following a review of sites post Regulation-18 it has been concluded that an extension to promoted site SN0278 would offer a number of benefits to the settlement that could not be achieved via the delivery of SN0268SL and SN0262. The site remains a REASONABLE option for development but is no longer considered as a preferred development site for the VCHAP.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes (at a lower density than promoted for)

Rejected:

Date Completed: 6 August 2020
Date Updated: 5 May 2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0268SL
Site address	Land north of Church Road, Woodton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated / agricultural land
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.47ha
Promoted Site Use, including (ii) Allocated site (jj) SL extension	Both - settlement limit extension (due to site size) however the number of dwellings the site is promoted for would equate to a site allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	34dph (promoted for 14-16 dwellings) 11 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>No existing access to the site but this would be possible to achieve. NCC Highways to confirm</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to provision of acceptable visibility onto Church Road and demonstration of adequate visibility at Church Road/B1332 junction. Ensure Church Road between the site and B1332 to at least 5.5m Widen existing f/w to 2.0m at site frontage, extend f/w at south side of Church Road westwards to play area access and provide a suitable facility to enable a safe footway crossing away from the junction with B1332 Norwich Road. Widen footway from site to village school.</p> <p><i>(NCC Highways meeting 16/12/20: – a combination of development on [SN0262/SN0268/SN0278] would be preferable in highways terms, the junction with the B1332 has been improved, and there is pedestrian access to the school through the new recreation area.)</i></p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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	Local services include: primary school, public transport, play area Primary school – approximately 500m Public transport – approximately 320m Play area – approximately 280m PH & village stores – approximately 1170m	
<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 		(see above)	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utilities capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known utilities infrastructure constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues NCC M&W – this site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site progresses as an allocation then	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		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.	
Flood Risk	Green	No identified areas of flooding or flood risk LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. There is no surface water risk identified on this site as shown in the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. Watercourse not apparent (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). No AW connection.	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 – open countryside with sporadic settlements and small pockets of woodland ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Minor impact on the landscape setting due to the small scale of development proposed SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER would prefer to see linear development on this site combined with SN0262.	Green
Townscape	Green	If linear development, this would continue the existing linear form of development. Site is removed from the main settlement but would be read in the context of the existing	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		row of dwellings. Preference would be for development in conjunction with SN0262.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Due to proximity of wooded area an ecological survey may be necessary NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	LBs in the vicinity of the site, including a Church however this is some distance from the site with good separation and no visual connectivity SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green. Fewer issues than with SN0262. HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Previously scored as amber in the GNLP HELAA due to concerns about the local road network. NCC Highways to advise. NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to provision of acceptable visibility onto Church Road and demonstration of adequate visibility at Church Road/B1332 junction. Ensure Church Road between the site and B1332 to at least 5.5m Widen existing f/w to 2.0m at site frontage, extend f/w at south side of Church Road westwards to play area access and provide a suitable facility to enable a safe footway crossing away from the junction with B1332 Norwich Road. Widen footway from site to village school. <i>(NCC Highways meeting 16/12/20: – a combination of development on [SN0262/SN0268/SN0278] would be preferable in highways terms, the junction with the B1332 has been</i>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<i>improved, and there is pedestrian access to the school through the new recreation area.)</i>	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	There is good separation from the proposed site and the church therefore there are no heritage issues. The site is separate from the main settlement area however it is adjacent to an existing row of semi-detached properties and a similar design would read as a continuation of this linear development pattern (see also SN0262)	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Road frontage access achievable onto Church Road. Safe access to the highway appears to be achievable. Existing footway running along the site frontage and leading into the recreation ground and main village area to the south	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site appears to be largely level with no significant changes in levels however it was densely covered in vegetation at the time of the site visit	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open site boundaries to the north and west as the land forms part of a larger parcel. There is a vegetation along the southern boundary (road frontage)	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No obvious ecological issues however the boundary hedgerow to the south would need to be removed to allow access to the site – to be checked by the Landscape Officer	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)	None that are obvious	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are currently restricted due to the front boundary hedgerow however further to the north and west there is an existing tree belt/ boundary line which is visible. There are wider open views to the south of the site on the opposite side of Church Road	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)	As an extension to the existing linear development a similar form of housing would be acceptable in this location, although for a lower number of dwellings than the land is promoted for. Development of this site would be more coherent in terms of creating a ‘feeling of place’ if the site is developed alongside SN0262.	Green

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	No conflicting LP 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 – multiple 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?	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:	Site is noted as being available within the first 5 years of the plan period but the land is currently tenanted.	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 additional information submitted	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes – upgrades will be required to the access and possibly to the road network. Possible crossing across Church Rd required. NCC to advise.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes but no additional information submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

If brought forward in conjunction with SN0262 the site is considered to be suitable for development and no significant constraints have been identified. The site has been promoted as an extension to the settlement limit but for a larger number of dwellings. Development on this site would need to be a lower number than it has been promoted for and should be linear in form to complement the existing row of dwellings.

Site Visit Observations

With appropriate design a linear development would complement the existing row of dwellings adjacent to the site however in terms of the wider landscape impact this would only be preferable if the nearby site SN0262 is also allocated. Development would not impact on identified heritage assets. The boundary hedgerow should be assessed by the Landscape Officer for its significance. Access onto Church Road appears to be achievable and despite the separation of the site from the centre of the settlement the site is well connected.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

The promoter has advised that the site is available for development within the first 5 years of the plan period, however they have also advised that the land is currently tenanted.

Achievability

The promoter has advised that the site is viable, including with a provision of affordable housing however it is not considered appropriate to develop the site at a scale that would trigger a requirement for affordable housing unless the site is allocated as part of a larger allocation alongside SN0262.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a REASONABLE site for allocation if combined with SN0262. A linear form of development would complement the existing semi-detached properties. However, as a standalone SL site, it is not considered that this would be an appropriate location for development due to its separation from the main area of development within the settlement.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST REGULATION-18 CONSULTATION:

Following a review of sites post Regulation-18 it has been concluded that an extension to promoted site SN0278 would offer a number of benefits to the settlement that could not be achieved via the delivery of SN0268SL and SN0262. The site remains a REASONABLE option for development but is no longer considered as a preferred development site for the VCHAP.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes (at a lower density)

Rejected:

Date Completed: 6 August 2020
Date Updated: 5 May 2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2183
Site address	Land south of Wymondham Road, Wreningham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.1 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (kk) Allocated site (ll) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 20 dwellings = 9.5 dph (25 dph = 52 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Field access from Wymondham Road. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. Access would require site frontage c/w widening to 5.5m, 2m wide footway and removal of entire frontage hedge. Wider local network is restricted in width, lacks footway and restricted visibility at adjacent junctions. No footway to catchment primary school.</p> <p>Highways Meeting - Slightly better than SN0431REV, as Wymondham Road is marginally wider but still no footways and limited verges. Visibility onto The Street is blind. Frontage development only, long frontage could help reinforce vehicle speeds. Could provide improvements to the Wymondham Road/Church Road junction (although this is third party land and requires hedge removal). No walking route to the school.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	250m walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities and bus service (including peak) within 1800m	
<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 		Village hall (with groups), recreation ground and public house within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises electricity, water, foul drainage to site. No UKPN constraints.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site is within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Identified SW flow path along northern and eastern boundaries.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Settled Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		D1: Wymondham settled plateau farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Adjacent to settlement on three sides and relatively contained. Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. SND Landscape Officer - Landscape caution. Development of the site would be contrary to the existing settlement pattern. Mature established hedgerow to the north of the site as well as large trees along the boundary.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. SNC Heritage Officer – Green.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network may be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecologist – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No detrimental impact on designated or non-designated HAs. SNC Heritage Officer – Green. Listed building and barn to south setting not that affected as buildings are orientated to face east/west. HES – Amber.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Access would require site frontage c/w widening to 5.5m, 2m wide footway and removal of entire frontage hedge. Wider local network is restricted in width, lacks footway and restricted visibility at adjacent junctions. No footway to catchment primary school.</p> <p>Highways Meeting - Slightly better than SN0431REV, as Wymondham Road is marginally wider but still no footways and limited verges. Visibility onto The Street is blind. Frontage development only, long frontage could help reinforce vehicle speeds. Could provide improvements to the Wymondham Road/Church Road junction (although this is third party land and requires hedge removal). No walking route to the school.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm if improved access is achievable while retaining significant trees. Appears that visibility can be achieved within same ownership	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/ residential – compatible uses	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)	Hedgerow to north and east. Some significant trees to be assessed. Open to farmland to west and south	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow to boundaries with some larger trees. Ditch along northern and eastern boundary and leading to pond outside southern boundary.	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)	Telegraph poles and O/H lines along highway frontage. No evidence of contamination.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site prominent and open in views along Wymondham Road and from open farmland to west.	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>Close to school and local services. Lack of footpath provision with wider verge at points which is characteristic of settlement. Frontage development would reflect that on northern side of Wymondham Road subject to satisfactory landscape and drainage mitigation measures. Plot depth and set back to reflect layout in WREN1</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	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)	Unknown	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		

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 statement from promoter	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes, access required, footpath and possible improvements at Church Road junction. Robust drainage strategy required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Supporting statement from promoter	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Suitable for allocation for smaller area development only subject to satisfactory access, drainage strategy and landscaping to boundaries.

Site Visit Observations

Close to school and local services. Lack of footpath provision which is characteristic of settlement. Frontage development only would reflect that on northern side of Wymondham Road subject to satisfactory landscape and drainage mitigation measures. Plot depth and set back to reflect layout in WREN1.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Promoter has advised development achievable within 1-5 years.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is **REASONABLE**. It is adjacent to the settlement limit and close to the school and although the route has no footpath it is within the village 30mph speed restriction where there is already pedestrian movement and some verges. The size of the site is out of scale and character with the village as promoted, 2.1ha (52 dwellings) however, a reduced site area would relate to the existing settlement and read as part of the existing built form. It could be frontage development possibly with a small cul-de-sac to mirror the development on the opposite side of the road. It could be contained by substantial planting to the west so that it would not encroach significantly into the countryside to the south. It would require the removal of a frontage hedge line for access and the ditches and surface water would need to be addressed. There is a highway safety concern with access visibility onto The Street and the junction at Church Road but highway improvements could be sought depending on the size of the development.

UPDATE POST REGULATION-18 CONSULTATION: This site has been considered further and remains a reasonable option however a number of constraints have been identified that have resulted in the site being reclassified from preferred to shortlisted. Concerns have been raised by a number of consultees including the Highways Authority, the LLFA, Historic Environment and the landscape officer about this site. Appropriate mitigation measures may be achievable for some of these constraints and as such the site is considered as a reasonable site for shortlisting.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 12 January 2021

Date Updated: 5 May 2022