Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Updated Site Assessments

Allocations and Settlement Limit Extensions

January 2023

Contents

Allocations

Settlement Limit Extensions

ALLOCATIONS

1. Alpington, Yelverton and Bergh Apton Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0400 / VC ALP1
Site address	Land at Church Meadow, Alpington
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	2014/2460 - 21 dwellings EIA not required. 2014/2608 - 21 dwellings, refused. Reasonable alternative at last Local Plan.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.87ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(a) Allocated site** **(b) SL extension**	Allocated site for up to 22 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted at 11.8/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 from Church Meadow, which appears to be the same width as the existing road and footways. NCC Highways – Amber, footway access to school, good standard junction at Church Meadow/Church Road. Carriageway widening to 5.5m required in vicinity of junction with Church Road. NCC Highways Meeting - Church Meadow access is sufficient/ satisfactory. Existing footway to the school with a good junction at Church Road. Public comments refer to need for widening of Church Road and additional crossing point. As development is of a similar scale to that previously proposed these details are required; key issue would be road widening on Church Road by the Church Meadow junction; potentially formalize existing unmarked bus stops; crossing point to the village hall, but this would not need to be a substantial.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Primary School - 500m Bus stop on X2 route (Slade Rd) - 1,600m Aldis & Sons Farm Shop - 1,800m Variety of small-scale local employment in the vicinity.	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall with Recreation Ground - 250m Yelverton Football Club & Pavilion - 550m Pub - 800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific know constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified on/close to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for NR14 7NY 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 450m from the site in question) and a	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		graveyard. Neither of these are considered significant. - 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	1:1000 year surface water flooding in the centre/southern end of the site. LLFA - Few or no constraints.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Part Tributary Farmland Part Settled Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		Majority of site is Settled Plateau Farmland, with small area to the south in Tributary Farmland.	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	No designated landscapes, but veteran tree in the northeast corner. Well contained site, with mature trees and hedging to the north and west. Grade 3 Agricultural Land. SNC Landscape Meeting – Acceptable, visually contained site, no landscape objections to previous application 2014/2608. Any development would need to improve situation for veteran tree, and retain boundary vegetation.	Green
Townscape	Green	Well contained site with modern (late C20) housing development to the south and east.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		SNC Heritage & Design – Green	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designated sites within close proximity. However some mature hedgerow/tress on the boundary, which are likely to require protection.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	St Mary's Church, Yelverton to the north east of the site, although existing houses and sports pavilion are between the church and this site. No obvious inter-visibility. SNC Heritage & Design – Green, no real impact on setting of church because of existing development to the east. HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space, although there would appear to be informal paths across the north west of the site.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Requires access through existing residential development, but otherwise links to the current network serving the village, which links to the A146 and Poringland. NCC Highways – Green, footway access to school, good standard junction at Church Meadow/Church Road. Carriageway widening to 5.5m required in vicinity of junction with Church Road. NCC Highways Meeting - Church Meadow access is sufficient/ satisfactory. Existing footway to the school with a good junction at Church Road.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Medium/low density housing to the south and east. Sports field to the north. Agricultural to the west. SNC Env Services – Green. Amenity:	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		- No issues observed.	

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Well contained site, which could be developed at a similar density to the adjoining Church Meadow development.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Road width access from Church Meadow	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield, although parts of the field appear to have been fenced off for domestic use and to keep horses/ponies.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to the south and east, football club to the north, agricultural to the west. 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)	Mature hedgerows with trees to the north and west, domestic boundaries to the south and east.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some mature trees within the hedgerows on the boundary/just outside of the site. Veteran in the north east corner.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Greenfield, 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	Public views are limited, principally from the main access point.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Well contained site, with limited features within the site itself, but mature hedgerows to the north and west boundaries. Would appear suitable for similar scale/density development to the adjoining Church Meadow housing.	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)**
Open Countryside		
Conclusion	Adjoining the Development Boundary	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Not currently being market, is being promoted on behalf of Ottley Properties.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	
Comments:	Site was vacant at the time of promotion, but appears to have some domestic use at present.	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)	Evidence has been supplied, including an updated layout for the site, however much of this dates from the original 2016 submission. Site being promoted on behalf of an established house builder. 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)	Large site, capable of accommodating open space. It is not envisaged that any 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?	Potentially an enhanced level of open space, given the size/shape of the site and the ability to accommodate 25 dwellings.	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

No overriding constraints and site is reasonably located to access local services/facilities with good standards roads and footway links. Greenfield site, adjacent to the existing development boundary.

Site Visit Observations

Well contained site, which could be developed at a similar density to the adjoining development. Protection of the veteran tree and the mature landscaping to the existing boundaries is required.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but adjacent to the existing Development Boundary.

Availability

Promoter states that the site is available, viable and in the ownership of a developer.

Achievability

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable – the site is well located in terms of access to local services/facilities, with footway links to those in the village. The site is visually well contained, with no overriding constraints. Suitable for allocation for up to 25 dwellings, reflecting the scale and density of Church Meadow and the constraints of the site shape. Opportunity to enhance the setting the veteran tree in the north east corner of the site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Given the size of the site and the identified constraints, the site is considered suitable for 'approximately', rather than 'up to', 25 dwellings, subject to addressing the criteria in the allocation policy.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 05/11/20

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0412 / VC BAP1
Site address	Former concrete works, Church Road, Bergh Apton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.7 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(c) Allocated site** **(d) SL extension**	Allocation of 12-25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Brownfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
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	Potential access constraints could be overcome through development NCC Highways – Red, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No safe walking route to school. NCC Highways Meeting - Reasonable to support a brownfield site with previous associated traffic movements. The site would probably be best developed with a less formal layout/highways infrastructure, emphasising it's rural location. Shouldn't result in higher traffic numbers than previous use of the site (recognising that this will have included a high proportion of HGVs); minimum is road widening and footpath along site frontage but ideally as far as the St/Church Rd junction to the east. However, there	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		may be limitations due to third party land constraints - so an alternative would be to provide passing places ("localised improvements to Church Road"). The policy for this site should be prescriptive to ensure no upwards creep of numbers on site beyond what has been accepted by HA.	
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Alpington & Bergh Apton school is 2.1 km with no footways Farm shop with post office is 2.4km away with no footways Bus service is 300 metres away	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Bergh Apton village hall is 1.1km away with no footways The Wheel of Fortune PH in Alpington is 2.5 km away with no footways until you get the settlement of Alpington	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewerage infrastructure upgrades and off-site mains reinforcement may be required	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	The site promoter has stated that mains water supply and electricity are available on the site. Sewerage is not	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	Site is likely to be contaminated to some extent but should be able to be mitigated	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Some identified surface water flood risk on site but can be mitigated LLFA - Few or no constraints.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is currently detrimental to local landscape, but is quite open and visible so new development would need to be sensitively designed with mitigation through landscaping SNC Landscape Meeting - does not appear to be incompatible with LCA, subject to appropriate scheme design. Opportunity to enhance views to the north from the nearby PRoW. Existing vegetation does not appear to be historic and is a non-native mix.	Green
Townscape	Green	Adjacent to one dwelling but otherwise removed from the settlement SNC Heritage & Design – Green	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Unlikely to have an adverse impact given existing use on site. Potential for enhancement	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		NCC Ecology – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	
Historic Environment	Green	No identified heritage asset affected by development SNC Heritage & Design – Green HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Narrow country lane may need improvements NCC Highways – Red, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No safe walking route to school. NCC Highways Meeting - Reasonable to support a brownfield site with previous associated traffic movements. The site would probably be best developed with a less formal layout/highways infrastructure, emphasising it's rural location.	Amber
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 relates poorly to existing settlement but may be some potential to link site to existing cluster of development at junction of corner of The Street and Church Road through development of site SN0203. Alternatively it could be another small standalone cluster of development as is characteristic of the settlement. No adverse impact on historic environment	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Need to consult with highway authority further. Existing access into site but Church Road is rural and narrow and if highway authority seek improvements could result in loss of hedgerows and trees	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Brownfield use with structures on site that will increase development costs. However, benefits from removing these derelict structures	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Mainly agricultural with one dwelling to east so 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)	Hedgerows and some trees on boundary	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some habitat possible in 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)	Some potential for contamination on 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	Views available into site from Church Road. Relatively contained from other directions by planting, although some views possible from Lower Kiln Lane to 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)	As a brownfield site there benefits from redevelopment of this site. It is separated from the other parts of the settlement along a narrow country lane, although this is common for most parts of Bergh Apton.	

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	

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	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? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately/Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting 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)	May be requirement to improvements to Church Road	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified other than removal of derelict brownfield site	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Whilst the site is not ideally located on a narrow country lane, there is a long-standing historic traffic use which can be offset against the traffic from new housing. As well as the removal of existing industrial/storage building on site, the development would be broadly in keeping with the character of Bergh Apton as cluster groups of dwellings, rather than infill the gaps between the clusters. Existing vegetation around the site is relatively recent and non-native.

Site Visit Observations

Brownfield site separated from the other parts of the settlement along a narrow country lane, although this is common for most parts of Bergh Apton.

Local Plan Designations

Outside and removed from development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable – whilst the site is not ideal in terms of highways access, the traffic generated by former uses (and potential lawful uses of the site) can be offset against the traffic from any redevelopment. Consideration needs to be given to the level of highways works that would be appropriate in this rural setting. The site could be seen as compatible with the pattern of small clustered groups of dwellings that make up Bergh Apton, and preferable to further infilling between the clusters. The site itself has few constraints other than the clearance and clean-up costs related to the current buildings, hardstanding etc. Existing vegetation is non-native and redevelopment offers an opportunity to enhance the site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Following the Regulation 18 consultation the site has been confirmed as suitable for up to 25 dwellings, principally reflecting the balance between the highways/accessibility constraints and needing to cover the costs of redeveloping an intensively used brownfield site.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 23/06/2020

2. Aslacton, Great Moulton and Tibenham Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0459REVA / VC ASL1
Site address	Land off Church Road, Aslacton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2019/0460 (15 dwellings approved on land south of Church Road)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.40 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(e) Allocated site** **(f) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for approx. 33 dwellings with a 1-acre village green, car parking related to the nearby school and possible public building with associated additional parking.
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	Site bounded by Church Road and Muir Lane. Potential access constraints could be overcome through development Highways score (SN0459) – Amber. Adjacent cul-de-sac not adopted so not available for pedestrian link to Church Road. C/w narrow at 3.6m (measured via NMB). Possible land available for f/w but would require removal of what may be a privately owned hedge. C/w could be widened over length of site frontage to allow safe access from east but safe pedestrian access to existing settlement is problematic. Highways Meeting (SN0459)- Subject to carriageway widening of Church Road to 5.5m between the existing layby west of the site to the junction with Muir Lane and at Muir Lane for full extent of site frontage. Provide 2.0m footway for full extent of Church Lane frontage and from Muir Lane junction north to the existing bus stop. Bus stops to be upgraded to comply with DDA requirements.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	120m walk to primary school (no footpath for 60m) Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops immediately adjacent to site on Muir Lane	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Mobile library Great Moulton Coronation Hall – 950m Fox & Hounds PH – 1,400m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed. AW advise sewers crossing the site (south east corner)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, gas, electricity and foul drainage available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Identified area of flood risk along Muir Lane to east (adjacent to the site boundary) would need to be taken into consideration	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		LLFA score (GNLP for SN0459)– Green (standard information required)	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Part Tributary Farmland with Parkland Part Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland B1: Tas Tributary Farmland ALC grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is open in wider views. Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated through design and boundary planting	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated through design reflecting character and density of adjacent development Heritage & Conservation Officer (SN0459) - This could continue linear form of development with housing to west. New development already approved to the south the road. Up to 40 units appears large allocation considering the small size of the village and rural location. The rural location needs to be taken into account in density, landscaping, type of units etc. Note the small public space to the east – this would be good in townscape terms to maintain the rural character of the lane.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Hedges and trees present. Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species, but the impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Red	Development could have a detrimental impact on designated heritage assets, but the impact could be reasonably mitigated Heritage & Conservation Officer (SN0459) – Amber. PP granted for development on the south side of the road impacts on the original HELAA score and that development impacts upon the setting of church Farm. Development of this site would not result in additional adverse impact although consideration should be given to having some space and reestablishment of the hedgerow to the corner/Muir Lane to enhance rural character at junction. Development to take into account the wider setting of Church Farm as seen from the junction. HES Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space. The proposal is to create a new village green of 1ha.	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Any potential impact on highway network could be reasonably mitigated. NCC to confirm. FP6 along west boundary. Highways score (SN0459) – Amber. Adjacent cul-de-sac not adopted so not available for pedestrian link to Church Road. C/w narrow at 3.6m (measured via NMB). Possible land available for f/w but would require removal of what may be a privately owned hedge. C/w could be widened over length of site frontage to allow safe access from east but safe pedestrian access to existing settlement is problematic. Highways Meeting (SN0459) -	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Subject to carriageway widening of Church Road to 5.5m between the existing layby west of the site to the junction with Muir Lane and at Muir Lane for full extent of site frontage. Provide 2.0m footway for full extent of Church Lane frontage and from Muir Lane junction north to the existing bus stop. Bus stops to be upgraded to comply with DDA requirements.	
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?	Residential development already approved on site to south. Consider impacts could be mitigated. Technical officer to confirm	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No formal access currently. NCC to advise and confirm status of verge to allow footpath extension	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	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)	Part of larger parcel of agricultural land. Open boundaries to north, east and south. Hedgerow along PROW on western boundary and partial hedgerow to north on eastern boundary.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow to eastern and western boundary along PROW.	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	Open in wider views from north and east. Site prominent in views along highways.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Consider that impacts of development likely to be reasonably mitigated subject to footpath improvement and satisfactory access. To include screening of boundaries to minimise wider visual impact. Suitable for allocation for approximately 33 dwellings in estate layout to reflect character and density of surrounding development.	

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)	No	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)	Statement from promoter including landscape and utilities assessments.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Access and footpath improvement - 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?	A 1 acre village green is proposed on the frontage, alongside circa 15 parking spaces related to the nearby school, plus the possibility of a public building and further parking.	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site itself has no overriding constraints and is suitable for development subject to satisfactory layout and density and footpath/access improvements.

Site Visit Observations

Consider that impacts of development likely to be reasonably mitigated subject to footpath improvement and satisfactory access. To include screening of boundaries to minimise wider visual impact. Suitable for allocation for approximately 33 dwellings in estate layout to reflect character and density of surrounding development.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations – open countryside

Availability

Promoter/developer has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

No significant constraints to delivery identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a REASONABLE site subject to its development taking into account the highways requirements, and at a density/with landscaping to reflect the edge of village location. Impacts associated with development in this location could be reasonably mitigated.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Following discussion with the Parish Council and the site promoter, the site could deliver additional benefits in terms of a village green and parking to alleviate issues with the school and church. On this basis the site has been enlarged to approximately 35 dwellings. The site is extended to the east, with a requirement to extend the frontage footways to the bus stops on Muir Lane, and with a curved boundary to the north, with a requirement to integrate the site with the wider rural landscape.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 28 April 2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5010 / VC GRE1
Site address	Land west of Heather Way, Great Moulton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Adjacent to south of site; 2019/1831/F for 15 dwellings, withdrawn 17/12/2019 resubmitted as 2020/0130/F for 14 (7 AH) approved.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.05
Promoted Site Use, including **(g) Allocated site** **(h) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	10-20 (would be 51 if @ 25 dph)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Submission states has access. Access has been left from Heather Way through recently approved development which currently serves seven plots also access has been retained from High Green with a footpath being provided through to Heather Way. NCC Highways – Amber. Not clear how access might be achieved, needs clarification. Wider highway network not suitable for development, no footway to catchment primary school. NCC Highways meeting - NCC find it difficult to support sites where walking to school is not a realistic possibility. Access from either High Green or Heather Way would be acceptable; although the latter would need to be designed to prevent further incremental development to the north. The main problem is the wider network in the immediate vicinity, which is narrow, with limited footways.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Aslacton Primary School; 2,000m 2 routes, although no path or lighting. Bus stop, limited service Norwich to Diss: 400m on Woodrow Lane, although no path or lighting. Limited employment within 1800m	N/A
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	N/A	Pub, Fox & Hounds; 650m Village Hall: 1,300m Further away: Tibenham Community Hall and playing field	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	No known constraints. Likely to be available because of surrounding development. Environment Agency**:** Green	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Overhead cables	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1 SWFD 1:1000 - 2 small areas to north	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		centre of site. SWFD 1:100 – 2 smaller areas to north centre of site. An attenuation pond could be used to mitigate this. Adjacent site has a new ditch system and an attenuation pond. LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. The site is adjacent to a flow path. This must be considered in the site assessment. The on-site flood risk is minor flooding that could be associated with the adjacent flow path but the EA surface water mapping indicates it is separate ponding. We advise this must be considered in the site assessment. A large area of the site is unaffected by flood risk and has the potential to be developed. Environment Agency: Green	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland Plateau Farmland (small NW corner)	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	B1 - Tas Tributary Farmland E2 – Great Moulton Plateau Farmland (small NW corner) Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate (Green)	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is open and flat. It currently is visible from the south at High Green however once the approved development is completed the frontage of High Green will become part of the built-up area of the	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		village. The site is part of the same field and is contained to the northern boundary with an established hedge-line. This is on the same line as the existing bungalow development on Farrow Close and would not encroach beyond into the open countryside. This means that new development would be well contained; on two sides by residential which is largely within the development boundary and by field boundaries to the north and west. SNC Landscape Officer - PROW in proximity to the site; would need to consider appropriate northern boundary; open landscape. No issues with using existing access from either Heather Way or High Green.	
Townscape	Green	There is a mix of dwellings surrounding the site; bungalows around Heather Way & Farrow Close and fronting High Green to the south-east with the new detached properties to the south and older houses opposite on High Green. Development could be assimilated, graduating from two storey to single storey, with no significant detriment to the townscape. The amount of development would need to take account of the scale of the village. SNC Heritage Officer - Consideration should be given to connectivity with adjacent developments; no townscape issues.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Mature hedge-lines important to retain as green corridors for biodiversity. Monoculture field – low habitat value.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ but housing not listed - discharge of more than 5m3/day to ground requires Natural England consultation. Ponds within 250m - amber risk zone for great crested newts. Not in Green Infrastructure Corridor.	
Historic Environment	Green	Closest listed buildings are on south side of High Green. Other development lies between therefore no adverse impact. HES – Amber SNC Heritage Officer – No heritage issues.	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Well-connected within the existing road network. No safe walking route to school. The railway lies beyond to the west, no station nearby. NCC Highways – Red. Not clear how access might be achieved, needs clarification. Wider highway network not suitable for development, no footway to catchment primary school.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to east and south. Field to north.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Not in a conservation area and no close by listed buildings. Adjacent to existing residential development and new development which is under construction on High Green. Limited additional impact as would read as part of the village along High Green. Would relate well to the existing housing.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	There is a gate from Heather Way and recently approved development has access through, would need HA advice. No footpaths along High Green.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural. Nothing on the site, no demolition required.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat, slight slope – nothing significant.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Currently open to road frontage along High Green, due to change with new development. Hedge boundaries contain the site to north and west. 1960/70s residential development to east.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No, just hedgerows mentioned above.	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)	Electricity lines crossing the site diagonally east-west. No evidence of contamination, unlikely given arable use.	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 from south will be limited when new development is completed. Some views from Heather Way and Farrow Close from east and limited views from dwelling to west	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	because of hedge screening. Limited public views – some from Hallowing Lane and some from railway line. No long views and the site doesn't encroach into the countryside beyond the existing line of development.	
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)	Well related to existing development and contained so limited impact on the landscape. No vegetation within site, and boundaries could be retained therefore low impact on wildlife and no loss of planting. Additional native planting would be needed along northern boundary adjacent to open countryside to delineate and add habitat, also good pedestrian links to existing village to east and south. If taken forward would need to carefully consider the density and height of dwellings to best integrate and transition into countryside.	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)**
Adjacent: GRE1 Residential		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 – owner has full control.	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate) Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Immediately	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No. 14 units adjacent approved and commenced with same landowner, T. Heather. Being developed in partnership with Saffron Housing Trust Ltd. Adjacent site increased affordable units because of high demand in village. Architect in place. Indicates it is deliverable.	Green
Are on-site/off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes, over 15 units and there is a requirement for open space. Even if fewer than 15 were to be considered it should be viewed cumulatively with the adjacent new site as together they create a need for open space. This can be provided on-site. If the site is considered there would be an opportunity to seek an open space to benefit the whole village e.g. a village green or village orchard, as it is well located with	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
	two pedestrian accesses and it is a large site.	
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated will provide and already partnered with Saffron. Greenfield site in one ownership, no ransom strips therefore no issue with viability anticipated.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Not at this stage	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site lies immediately north of an allocation for 10 dwellings in the current Local Plan (of which three have been completed) and to the west of a four dwelling affordable housing scheme at the western end of Heather Way. Whilst the site is current very open to the High Green frontage, this would be completely changed by completion of the already allocated development; otherwise, the site is relatively contained to the east and west. There appear to be few on-site constraints. Access could be achieved either from High Green via the allocation site, or via Heather Way to the east. The settlement has relatively few facilities, which, together with some flood risk on the northern part of the site and the need for care in landscape terms, could limit the scale of development.

Site Visit Observations

Well related to existing development and contained so limited impact on the landscape. No vegetation within site, and boundaries could be retained therefore low impact on wildlife and no loss of planting. Additional native planting would be needed along northern boundary adjacent to open countryside to delineate and add habitat, also good pedestrian links to existing village to east and south.

If taken forward would need to carefully consider the density and height of dwellings to best integrate and transition into countryside.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability

The site promoter indicates the site is available.

Achievability

The site promoter indicates the site is deliverable, and is in the same ownership as the existing adjacent allocation site, which has commenced. That site has been delivered in conjunction with Saffron Housing, to deliver an overall higher affordable housing percentage than required by Policy. Would need to consider whether the site numbers should be considered in conjunction with the existing development re. the requirement for open space.

REVISED OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Development of the full site is likely to be out of keeping with the scale of the settlement and the available facilities. The northern part of the site is also identified as being at flood risk and considered more sensitive in landscape terms. However, the site is relatively unconstrained and relates well to the allocated and permitted dwellings immediately to the south and east. As such, a more limited development of at least 12 dwellings on the southern part of the site would be appropriate.

Preferred Site: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022

3. Barford, Marlingford, Colton and Wramplingham Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0552REVB / VC BAR1
Site address	Land at Cock Street and Watton Road, Barford
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Some of site to east is inside development boundary
Planning History	2000/0169/F for retention of 4 portable buildings refused 08/03/00 1987/2669/F for 1 dwelling approved 16/12/1987 (Harvest Cottage)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.76
Promoted Site Use, including **(i) Allocated site** **(j) SL extension**	Allocated site or could be extension to SL
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	None stated – plan shows 31 19 at 25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield (west), Brownfield (east)

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	Green	Existing accesses onto Cock Street and B1108, would need to consider number of dwellings compared to existing use and necessary visibility improvements. NCC Highways – Amber. Subject to access at Cock Street only with junction improvement at Cock St / B1108 junction, 2.0m footway at Cock St frontage and providing verge at B1108 frontage to enable future provision of 2.0m footway. NCC Highways meeting - Will need to close the existing garage access off Watton Road and access the site solely off Cock Street. Will need improvements to the Watton Road/Cock Street junction, with adequate visibility within dedicated highway land. The site should facilitate pedestrian/cycle access to/from Back Lane, either along the Watton Road frontage or through the site.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Barford Primary School; 280 metres from site Bus service runs past site along B1108 (bus stops approx. 100m) Local employment on B1108 (within 200m)	N/A
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	N/A	Distance to Barford village hall and recreation area; 400 metres (Cock public house, opposite the site is closed)	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	No known capacity issues. Applicant indicates all main utilities are available. Environment Agency: Green	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	No known infrastructure on site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Previous use as petrol filling station and existing car repairs will require investigation. Will necessitate removal of underground petrol storage tank if not already gone and investigation to ensure no leakage has occurred. Likely mitigation	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		required but not uncommon on former garage sites. Also may be asbestos present given the age and structure of the buildings.	
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1 Low risk of surface water flooding. LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints, on-site flood risk is very minor flooding concentrated to the site boundary. Standard information required at planning stage. Environment Agency: Green	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	East: Rural River Valley West: Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	A2 Yare/Tiffey Rural River Valley B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; West: Grade 3 Good to moderate East: non-agricultural	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	This area is partially inside the river valley designation. The site comprises two distinct areas; developed (east) and undeveloped (west). Residential development on the east side would not have a negative impact on the landscape as it's already part of the village. Residential development on the west would alter the character of this piece of land. It is the first site on the north side of the road when entering the village along the B1108 from the west, across a large open field which slopes down	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		to the village. However, it is currently screened on all public boundaries, containing it visually, and if these hedges were retained and reinforced it would maintain a definite edge and green approach to the village. It would not encroach into the countryside or have a negative impact on the river valley. There is a tree line north-south through the middle of the site which would be broken through if the west side were to be developed. SNC Landscape Officer - Retain hedging long Back Lane and Watton Road; would need to review the species and the general form/condition of the trees within the dividing tree belt between the two sections of the site - with careful consideration this could be a feature of the site. Tree belt has screened the existing garage in wider views on the approach into Barford, which as a settlement, is relatively well contained in views from the B1108.	
Townscape	Green	In the same way as above the distinct division of the site is relevant. The east side is already part of the townscape but is not an attractive site, re-development would improve it within the village. The site relates well to the townscape and the village. SNC Heritage Officer - Redevelopment of the garage could be viewed as a townscape benefit; the number of dwellings is high for the area; addressing Watton Road may be an issue as the hedgerow should be maintained.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Area to the east is grassland with significant tree boundaries, likely to be frequented by nesting birds. Would need to retain and consider enhancements for habitat gain. Would need a bat survey as old building would be demolished close to trees. NCC Ecologist: Amber. Car dealership. Amber risk zone for great crested newts but habitats onsite unlikely to support. SSSI IRZ but housing and discharge of water not identified for Natural England consultation. Not in GI corridor. No PROW.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Doesn't affect setting of non-designated heritage asset, the Cock public house, would improve the relationship visually by removing the commercial use. Listed farmhouse on opposite corner to south-west but not significantly affected, particularly if landscaping is retained. HES – Amber SNC Heritage Officer - With suitable design and retention of the hedgerow development will not have that much of an impact on Sayer Farm (listed) as the road strongly separates the area and the field to the north west would be retained	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Cock Lane is a direct link with footpaths to the school and village hall. There is a lack of footways along the B1108. However, the site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		is adjacent to the B1108 which is the main Watton Road from Norwich and connects directly to the A47 at Colney. On bus route and well connected. NCC Highways – Amber. Subject to access at Cock Street only with junction improvement at Cock St / B1108 junction, 2.0m footway at Cock St frontage and providing verge at B1108 frontage to enable future provision of 2.0m footway.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to north and opposite to east. Large house entrance on north of grassed area. Dispersed residential to south and open field to west. All compatible and there would be an improvement to amenity of the existing residential through removal of car sales and garage.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	None.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Already two accesses used for commercial use which presumably includes larger service vehicles. Would be possible to improve either of these.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Half of site; car sales and vehicle repairs which would create noise and activity with the potential for alternative uses to come to the site. Also an older existing dwelling and double garage. Half of site; appears to be private amenity land/garden area. Demolition would be required and reorganising of existing uses, would any be retained? Need to consider the loss of an employment use.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Adjacent are dwellings so would be compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat with a slope east to west and northwards.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Various. Commercial on part which has open boundaries to frontages and some fencing. Significant trees and hedging on all boundaries of grassed area of the site.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Yes trees and hedges on undeveloped part of site.	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)	Yes, potential for contamination of ground from previous garage use and existing commercial use. Would need investigation and mitigation. Pre-war buildings may have	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	asbestos which would need to be professionally removed. Electricity poles along frontage.	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site from main road. Commercial use is part of the built-up area but not attractive and could be improved through development. Views of grassed area are limited but the boundaries are significant as they are visible on the edge of the village and approaching on the B1108. Would be preferable to retain these. Limited views out of 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 area within the development boundary could be redeveloped in any case through a planning application and would represent a general aesthetic improvement, although the loss of an employment use would need to be considered. The adjacent grassed area relates to the village if accessed through the garage site. If dealt with sensitively and if the green boundaries were retained, it would not impact on the wider landscape as it is contained.	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)**
Development Boundary		N/A
River Valley		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	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)	No but owner has been approached.	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate) Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Immediately. Existing uses would need to be vacated.	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No, would need to take account of demolition and any remediation costs.	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	If whole site was development would trigger affordable housing requirement.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is well located in terms of distance to local services and bus access to Norwich and Watton. Subject to access from Cock Street and improvements to the junction with the B1108, the site has reasonable access. The site is made up of two distinct parcels: (1)the element within the existing Development Boundary is a brownfield garage, where opportunities exist to significantly improve the appearance of a prominent site on the B1108, balanced with the loss of employment and the cost of demolition and decontamination of the site; and (2) a greenfield site to the west, which is relatively unconstrained, but would need to be accessed via the brownfield site and would need to ensure retention of the significant hedges/trees around the site, for both visual containment and ecological value.

Site Visit Observations

The area within the development boundary could be redeveloped in any case through a planning application and would represent a general aesthetic improvement, although the loss of an employment use would need to be considered.

The adjacent grassed area relates to the village if accessed through the garage site. If dealt with sensitively and if the green boundaries were retained, it would not impact on the wider landscape as it is contained.

Local Plan Designations

The garage site is within the existing Development Limit for Barford, and redevelopment would need to be considered in relation to policies concerning the retention of rural employment. The greenfield element of the site outside the current Development Boundary, in the Countryside. The River Valley designation also cuts across the site.

Availability

The site promoter has indicated that the site would be available immediately once the current use has vacated and that there has been developer interest in the site.

Achievability

The site promoter has indicated that the site is deliverable, however no supporting evidence has been submitted and as well as the normal requirement (for affordable units, open space, highways improvements etc.), there would be costs associated with decommissioning the former/existing uses.

REVISED OVERALL CONCLUSION:

(Based on amended site submitted during the Regulation 18 Consultation)

The site is well located in terms of distance to local services and bus access to Norwich and Watton. Subject to access from Cock Street, improvements to the junction with the B1108, and provision of a verge on the B1108, the site is likely to be acceptable in highways terms. The site is made up of two distinct parcels: (1) the element within the existing Development Boundary is a brownfield garage, where opportunities exist to significantly improve the appearance of a prominent site on the B1108, balanced with the loss of employment and the cost of demolition and decontamination of the site; and (2) a greenfield site to the west, which is relatively unconstrained, but would need to be accessed via the brownfield site and would need to ensure retention of the significant hedges/trees around the site, for

both visual containment, limiting any impact on the nearby listed building, and ecological value. Given the balance between the costs of developing the brownfield element of the site and the other constraints, an allocation of approximately 20 dwellings is considered appropriate.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 28/04/2022

4. Barnham Broom, Kimberley, Carleton Forehoe, Runhall and Brandon Parva Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4051 / VC BB1
Site address	Land on the corner of Bell Road and Norwich Road, Barnham Broom
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.44 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(k) Allocated site** **(l) SL extension**	Allocation – 45-50 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 35 dwellings/ha as promoted.
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Constraints on providing access **NCC Highways** - Green - Bell Rd/Mill Rd/Norwich Rd junction visibility is a constraint and would require realignment of Bell Rd to satisfactorily resolve. Bus stop relocation also required. **NCC Highways Meeting** – This site offers the opportunity to realign Bell Road and improve the current junction arrangement. **NCC Highways Meeting** - Realign Bell Road through the site to improve the visibility on all routes into the junction (existing junction has substandard visibility), particularly forward visibility to the west when exiting Bell Road, and provide a stagger to the junction. There would be significant costs associated with this work which would justify increased numbers on the site however the policy should be clear about the works required to avoid a developer paying increased land costs.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Distance to Barnham Broom Primary School 500 metres with footway Bus stops on Norwich Road adjacent to site Shop / post office adjacent to site on opposite side of Bell Road	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Barnham Broom sports pavilion and recreation area 520 metres The Bell Inn public house adjacent to site on opposite side of Bell Road	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	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 **SNV Env Services:** Land Quality - Having regard to the history of the site along with its size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application.	
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified surface water flood risk on site **LLFA** - Mitigation required for heavy constraints.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B6 Yare Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Some potential coalescence of individual parts of Barnham Broom. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land. **Landscape meeting** - Poor site in landscape terms as the site has significant landscape character issues. There would also be a loss of significant hedgerows.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Limited existing development on eastern side of Bell Road **SNC Heritage** – Amber, in terms of urban design, the village lacks a recognisable 'heart'. This development site creates the opportunity to achieve that with well-designed public space. This would be near the post office and the bus stop – so could provide a useful village amenity. If we can achieve some positive outcomes like provision of village green etc that	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		may be of some benefit and help towards created an enhanced sense of place.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity **NCC Ecology** – Green, but SSSI IRZ, potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Non-designated heritage assets on opposite side of Bell Road **SNC Heritage** – Amber, it will affect to some degree the setting of the farm buildings to the east, which are however not listed, but can be considered non-designated heritage assets. It will also erode the gap in the settlement which divides the part of the village to the west from the eastern parts. Retaining hedgerow and landscape planting to the east could help mitigate these impacts. **HES** - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Roads are of a reasonable standard and have footways **NCC Highways** - Amber - Bell Rd/Mill Rd/Norwich Rd junction visibility is a constraint and would require realignment of Bell Rd to satisfactorily resolve. Bus stop relocation also required. **NCC Highways Meeting** – This site offers the opportunity to realign Bell Road and improve the current junction arrangement.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential **SNC Env Services:** Amenity - The site in question is close to The Bell Inn, Bell Road, Barnham Broom, Norfolk, NR9 4AA.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		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.	

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Currently no estate development east of Bell Road, however would help created nucleated centre to village. Would have some impact on setting of non-designated heritage assets to east and west, particularly by detracting from rural setting of Manor Farm to east and also from erosion of gap between different parts of settlement.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable from either Bell Road or Norwich Road, however either would require loss of hedgerow	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no potential 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 west, along with public house and shop on opposite side of road to west. It is not considered that this relationship would result in any compatibility issues. Agricultural field to south.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge with trees along all boundaries.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Cluster of trees within site, plus habitat in trees and hedges on boundaries. Pond in land to east	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

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 site from both Norwich Road and Bell Road are possible, particularly from Bell Road where the field access is towards the south of the 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)	An allocation of 25 dwellings could be considered on the northern portion of the site as it is a location which could strengthen the nucleated core of the village, albeit by extending estate development east of Bell Road with erosion of gap between different parts of settlement. This is subject to an access being achievable with no loss of important trees and minimising any loss of hedgerow and surface water flood risk issues being addressed	

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 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? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately/Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting 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)	Some footway improvements may be required	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?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site could be suitable for allocation for 25 dwellings if reduced in size. The site is centrally located within the village and is in a location which would allow for highway improvements to the Bell Road/Mill Road/Norwich Road junction. However, such realignment would lead to the loss of hedging on one or both road frontages. Surface water flood risk issues would need to be mitigated.

Site Visit Observations

Development could be considered on the northern portion of the site as it is a location which could strengthen the nucleated core of the village, albeit by extending estate development east of Bell Road. Boundaries are defined by hedgerows and a number of trees, however some of these could be lost to create the necessary highways improvements.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable - The site is centrally located within the village, with good access to the local services and facilities. However potential allocation of the site balances a number of issues; whist there is the ability to realign Bell Road to create a better junction arrangement with Mill Road/Norwich Road, and also to create a focal point for the settlement, close to the post office stores and pub, these are offset against the loss of trees and hedgerows around the site, the erosion of the gap which separates the eastern and western parts of the village and the setting of a non-designated heritage asset.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

The site needs to balance funding the necessary highways improvements against needing to create a focal point for the village, protection of the environmental assets and achieving an acceptable density of development; as such an allocation of approximately 40 dwellings is considered appropriate.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 15 October 2020

5. Bawburgh Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4053 / VC BAW1
Site address	Land to the east of Stocks Hill, Bawburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(m) Allocated site** **(n) SL extension**	Allocation (The site has been promoted for 25 dwellings, plus a potential additional area of land to the east for public open space)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25 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

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	Green	Access is available from Stocks Hill **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Green. **NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING COMMENTS** – Preferred site - next to the school, existing footpath, suitable width carriageway, within the 20mph limit zone.	Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Primary School located approximately 200m from the site Some local employment opportunities, including Bawburgh golf club. Other services available within neighbouring settlements.	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Public House – The Kings Head approximately 370m from the site Village hall and recreation ground located opposite the site on Stocks Hill	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No anticipated issues	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	No known contamination or ground stability issues **SNC ENV PROTECTION** - Land Quality: Having regard to the history of the site along with 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. Amenity: The site in question is close to the Village Hall, Stocks Hill, Bawburgh, Norfolk, NR9 3LL. Consideration should be given to the potential impact of the Village Hall on the amenity future residents along with the impact on the future viability of the Village Hall of introducing noise sensitive receptors close to it.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1 **LLFA** – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required. The site is a adjacent to a significant flowpath.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001*	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		A2 – Yare/Tiffey River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Grade 3 agricultural land The site forms part of the river valley and offers open views to the west. **SNC LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT** – The site would require a landscape assessment as it is an open landscape and visible from the SLBPZ. No significant vegetation on the site.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of the site would impact on the existing verdant characteristics of this part of Stocks Hill. This impact may be mitigated through an appropriate design solution	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	There are no known impacts upon biodiversity or geodiversity **NCC ECOLOGY** – Green. SSSI IRZ. Close to Yare Valley CWS. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Site is located adjacent to the conservation area and may impact views into the conservation area. It is	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		considered that this could be mitigated through appropriate design solutions. **HES** – Amber	
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Development of the site is not considered to impact the functioning of the local road network. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Green. **NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING COMMENTS** – Preferred site - next to the school, existing footpath, suitable width carriageway, within the 20mph limit zone.	Green
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?	Site offers open views across the River Valley. The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access from Stocks Hill. A new access would need to be formed.	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 and residential	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat. The site is in an elevated position at the top of Stocks Hill.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows to the north and south. Limited screening on the western edge of the site.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerows at site 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)	Electricity lines run along the front of the site and cross the site to the north	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are open views across the site looking over 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)	Development of the site will impact upon the landscape character of the area. The site is in a prominent position and offers open views across the river valley towards Norwich	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 Southern Bypass Land Protection Zone		N/A
River Valley		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Potential landscape constraints	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 is owned by a developer/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)	Site promoter has confirmed that site is 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?	Site promoter has confirmed that the site is viable	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	An area of public open space associated with the site has been suggested by the site promoter	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation. The site relates well to the main settlement and existing services. Development of the site would not significantly encroach into the open countryside however development in this location would be visible in long views towards the site, including from the SBLPZ and River Valley. No highways, heritage or flood constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

The site offers open views across the River Valley. The site relates well to the settlement and existing services.

Local Plan Designations

River Valley.

Availability

Promoter has confirmed the site is available.

Achievability

No identified issues.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a REASONABLE option for development. The site has a strong relationship with the existing built form of the settlement and would benefit from good connectivity. A landscape assessment would be required to determine the landscape impact of development in this location. There would not be a significant impact on existing vegetation on the site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Whilst the site was promoted as a 1ha plot for 25 dwellings, assessment of the site took into account that the promoter has indicated that additional land was available. Extending the site to 1.4ha, with the eastern boundary aligned with the curtilages of properties to the north and south, would create a site suitable for up to 35 dwellings, as consulted on during the Regulation 18 process.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 11 January 2021

6. Bressingham Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4036 / VC BRE1
Site address	Land to the east 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)	2.09ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(o) Allocated site** **(p) SL extension**	Allocated site with POS, landscaping and infrastructure
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 14 dph 12-30 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

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	Green	Access available from site frontage; site located immediately opposite the primary school; footpath on opposite side of the road Highways score – Green. Suitable for limited frontage development only and subject to c/w widening to min of 5.5m and provision of 2.0m frontage footway. NCC Highways meeting - SN4036 - Road widening and footpath along the site frontage required; likely to lose the mature tree along the site frontage; "frontage development" does not mean frontage only, but development should face onto the road along the site frontage - an estate road into the site could be supported; provision of passing places on School Road (route to the A1066) should be investigated.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Access to services including: school, village hall, public house Primary School – approximately 20m Bus stop – c. 50m Village shop – approximately 440m	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall, playing field – c. 440m Public House – approximately 800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No anticipated issues as the site is adjacent to the existing development within the settlement	Green
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 known contamination and ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Small area of surface water flooding in southern corner of site adjacent to Pine Tree Cottage LLFA score – Green (standard planning information required)	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		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 The site is well related to existing development and its development would have limited additional impact on the landscape	Green
Townscape	Green	Frontage development along School Road would continue the existing linear form of the settlement Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. 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. There is no particular significance attached to the area in the village character, and the field is quite well enclosed in landscape views, however there do appear to be some good trees around it. This site would allow a more efficient layout and provision of safer public space away from the School Lane. It would be good to set building back with establishment of a frontage boundary rather than creating too much of an urban character. There would probably need to be a need for landscape buffer strip for housing to the north.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ – potential for protected species and biodiversity net gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	LB (Pine Tree Cottage) immediately adjacent to the south of the site. Heritage Officer views to be sought. Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. Development would impact upon cottage which is to a degree isolated but it's character and setting does not depend on it being isolated. The north side is a plain pantiled roof with no windows facing north. I would however suggest mitigation at south end. HES – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Highways to advise on the impact on the local road network Highways score – Amber	Amber
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?	Impact on the LB to the south to be assessed by the heritage officer The site is well related to the existing built form of the settlement	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access to the site is possible from School Road. There is an existing footpath opposite the site along the school frontage. The footpath also extends further to the south.	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	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site appeared to be level but access onto the site was not possible	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Small tree and hedgerow. Existing vegetation provides screening between site and properties to the north. No significant boundaries between the site and the LB.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow along the site frontage which would likely be removed in its entirety for access and visibility	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 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	The site is enclosed within the streetscene due to the existing built form in the environs	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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 related to the centre of the village. It also relates well to the existing built form and would not have an adverse impact on the local landscape. The impact on the LB would need to be assessed however the location of the proposed school car park closest to the LB could address both the noted SW flooding issue and mitigate the impact of development on the setting of the 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 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 – multiple ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Enquiries received but not 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 – evidence not requested/ provided	
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unlikely to be required	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes but supporting evidence not submitted at this stage	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Part of the site is promoted for off-site parking for the primary school located opposite the site	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is well related to the centre of the settlement and subject to the comments of the heritage officer regarding the adjacent LB, as well as an appropriate design to address the area of surface water flooding, the site is considered to be suitable for development.

Site Visit Observations

The site would form a clearly defined addition to the existing settlement. It has a good relationship with surrounding properties (subject to LB comments above) and is well connected. Access is achievable and/or already in place. The development would not have an adverse impact on either the local landscape or townscape.

Local Plan Designations

No constraints identified

Availability

The land is considered to be available

Achievability

The land is considered to be achievable

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is well related and connected to existing services and facilities, it relates well to the settlement and has limited on-site/ off-site constraints identified. A larger site area is proposed to be retained as site includes proposed parking for the school, and also needs to protect the setting of the adjoining listed building, which is expected to require the provision of a large area of open space.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Within the above constraints, the site is considered suitable for allocation for up to 40 dwellings, as contained in the Regulation 18 consultation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 17 June 2020

7. Brooke, Kirstead and Howe Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0432REVA / VC BRO1 (part)
Site address	East of Norwich Road, Brooke
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	
Planning History	Part of 2018/1780 - 148 dwellings at 210 place primary school (withdrawn)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.0ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(q) Allocated site** **(r) SL extension**	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 15 dwellings at 15 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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Frontage to the B1332 Norwich Road, to the rear of an existing layby. Withdrawn application (2018/1780) required a roundabout, however it is not clear if this would be required for a substantially lower level of development, to reduce traffic speeds. NCC Highways Meeting - If both east and west of Norwich Road are developed, this may require a roundabout (and therefore more significant dwelling numbers to justify it) as a crossroads would not be acceptable, and a staggered junction might not be possible. Verge and layby to the east is within the existing Highway. A priority junction would be possible for either side, but may need to look at how to control speed of traffic approaching from the north. A (toucan) crossing is likely to be required for development to the east, to create a safer access to the school.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	• Primary School - 725m • Shop/Post Office/Garage - 575m • Park Farm complex – 900m • Employment - (Brooke Industrial Park) - 1,325m • Bus - Kings Head bus stop (41/X41 services) - 500m Various other small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity (vet, care home etc.).	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		• Village Hall (with recreation facilities and community cafe) - 450m • Pub (Kings Head – currently being refurbished) - 500m (White Lion also within 1,800m) Brooke Cricket Club - 850m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	No specific known constraints.	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified on/close to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Under consideration for upgrading for the NR15 1AB area.	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Greenfield site with no known issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	None identifeid	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		Chet Tributary Farmland.	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	No designated landscapes. Open agricultural landscape with few features to screen additional development. Grade 3 Agricultural Land. SNC Landscape Meeting - preference for development to the west (REVB) as there would be more visual screening. Appropriate density and design would avoid significant landscape harm, given the context of the previous development.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Would extend the growth of Brooke towards Poringland, with only the exiting field boundary delineating the wider from further expansion.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designated sites in close proximity.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Distant views of the Brooke Conservation Area from Norwich Road. Listed Building (Brooke Lodge) to the north west. Archaeological record north of the site. SNC Heritage & Design - No significant objection to these (REVA and/or REVB) coming forward. It is further extending the village in a linear manner along the Norwich Road, which is at odds with the historic east/west plan of the village –	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		however still not extending that far out. HES - Amber	
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Frontage to the B1332 Norwich Road and footpaths to the main village services and facilities. NCC Highways Meeting - If both east and west of Norwich Road are developed, this may require a roundabout (and therefore more significant dwelling numbers to justify it) as a crossroads would not be acceptable, and a staggered junction might not be possible. Verge and layby to the east is within the existing Highway. A priority junction would be possible for either side, but may need to look at how to control speed of traffic approaching from the north. A (toucan) crossing is likely to be required for development to the east, to create a safer access to the school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Low density residential on the existing B1332 frontage, agricultural land to the east, north and opposite side of the B1332.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Although Brooke Lodge listed building is immediately to the north, the grounds are heavily treed. Some possible impact on distant views of Brooke Conservation Area, although these would appear to be very limited. Extends the settlement northwards towards Poringland and would require reinforcement of the existing field boundary to the north marking the transition from built form to countryside.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Direct access to the B1332, may require speed reduction measures.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield, 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)	Low density residential to the south, fronting the B1332, which may impact on the form of development. Agricultural to the north, east and west. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site with no obvious concerns.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Domestic boundaries with existing properties. Open field boundaries to the road/layby frontage, north and east, which are likely to require reinforcement to give more containment to the site.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	The most significant trees are in the existing highway, between the lay-by and the B1332, or outside the site, rear of village hall.	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 wires along the northern boundary. Greenfield, 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	Open landscape with views across the site to woodland in the distance and Brooke village to the south.	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)	Open agricultural field with few features on the site itself, however it does afford views across the wider countryside. Well located in terms of access to services and facilities, and with direct access to the B1332.	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)**
Open Countryside		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Adjoins the existing Development Boundary to the south.	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)	Being promoted by a local house builder who has built the recent adjoining development.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	
Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Site has been part of a previous planning application, therefore there has been investigation of many of the issues related to development of the site. Promoter has confirmed that there are no ransom strips that would impede development.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Site owners control a larger land holding, therefore additional land for open space/GI could be made available. Highway works to reduce speeds on the B1332 may be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Broadly the site is suitable for development, subject to no overriding concerns regarding the impact on the Conservation Area or nearby listed buildings, and suitable access arrangements from the B1332. Otherwise the site is well located and relatively unconstrained.

Site Visit Observations

An open, level site with few features. However the site does provide views across the open countryside to woodlands and the Conservation Area beyond. Site boundaries would need reinforcement to give a level of containment, and carful design to create development in depth when adjoining development is principally frontage only.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but adjoins the existing Development Boundary at the southern edge of the site.

Availability

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

Achievability

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is well located and relatively unconstrained, however it is quite open in the landscape and development in depth to achieve a reasonable density/volume of dwellings would require careful design. Need to consider the highways requirements in relation to potential development on the west of Norwich Road.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

The site is considered suitable for allocation in conjunction with SN0432REVB (west of Norwich Road), with a combined site total of up to 50 dwellings, which will allow an element of flexibility in numbers between the two parts of the proposed allocation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0432REVB / VC BRO1 (part)
Site address	West of Norwich Road, Brooke
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	
Planning History	None relevant
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.2ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(s) Allocated site** **(t) SL extension**	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 12 to 25 dwellings. 21 dwellings/ha for 25 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	Frontage to the B1332 Norwich Road, may need measures to reduce vehicle speeds. NCC Highways – Amber, footway at east side of road, would require provision to west side. Possible highway safety concern with stopping/turning movements at good standard section of road. Preference would be to combine with SN2018 and provide 36m icd roundabout access with ped, cycles & emergency access via 2018 proposed access. Roundabout to be online, incorporating both parcels of land. Development layout to provide highway connections to land east and west of allocation. May require provision of a formal crossing facility at B1332 Norwich Rd near The Street/High Green. Subject to highway conditions in planning application. NCC Highways Meeting - If both east and west of Norwich Road are developed, this may require a roundabout (and therefore more	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		significant dwelling numbers to justify it) as a crossroads would not be acceptable, and a staggered junction might not be possible. Verge and layby to the east is within the existing Highway. A priority junction would be possible for either side, but may need to look at how to control speed of traffic approaching from the north. A (toucan) crossing is likely to be required for development to the east, to create a safer access to the school.	
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	• Primary School - 725m • Shop/Post Office/Garage - 575m • Park Farm complex - 900m • Employment - (Brooke Industrial Park) - 1,325m • Bus - Kings Head bus stop (41/X41 services) - 500m Various other small scale employment opportunities in the vicinity.	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		• Village Hall (with recreation facilities) - 450m • Pub (Kings Head – currently being refurbished) - 500m (White Lion also within 1,800m) Brooke Cricket Club - 850m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	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		Under consideration for upgrading for the NR15 1AB area.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Greenfield site with no known issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Pockets of Surface Water Flood Risk identified on the eastern half of the site, with small areas up to 1 in 30 year occurrence. LLFA - Mitigation required for heavy constraints.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		Site frontage (eastern part) Chet Tributary Farmland, rear of the site (western part) Tas Tributary Farmland.	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	No designated landscapes. Open agricultural landscape with few features to screen additional development. Grade 3 Agricultural Land SNC Landscape Meeting - preference for development to the west (REVB) as there would be more visual screening. Appropriate density and design would avoid significant landscape harm, given the context of the previous development.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Would extend the growth of Brooke towards Poringland, although further growth in this direction would be limited by the extensive grounds of Brooke Lodge.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designated sites in close proximity.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed (Brooke Lodge) property immediately to the north of the site. SNC Heritage & Design - No significant objection to these (REVA and/or REVB) coming forward. Rev B is quite close to Brooke Lodge – however it is situated in the middle of large curtilage with extensive landscaping so harmful impact on setting is likely to be low or negligible. It is further extending the village in a linear manner along the Norwich Road, which is at odds with the historic east/west plan of the village – however still not extending that far out. The plan submitted for RevB looks tight with small gardens and not very sympathetic to existing grain so I would be cautious about numbers allocated here. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Frontage to the B1332 Norwich Road, although footpaths are on the opposite side of the road. NCC Highways – Amber, footway at east side of road, would require provision to west side. Possible highway safety concern with stopping/turning movements at good standard section of road. Preference would be to combine with SN2018 and provide 36m icd roundabout access with ped, cycles & emergency access via 2018 proposed access. Roundabout to be online, incorporating both parcels of land. Development layout to provide highway connections to land east and west of allocation. May require provision of a formal crossing facility	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		at B1332 Norwich Rd near The Street/High Green. Subject to highway conditions in planning application. NCC Highways Meeting - If both east and west of Norwich Road are developed, this may require a roundabout (and therefore more significant dwelling numbers to justify it) as a crossroads would not be acceptable, and a staggered junction might not be possible. Verge and layby to the east is within the existing Highway. A priority junction would be possible for either side, but may need to look at how to control speed of traffic approaching from the north. A (toucan) crossing is likely to be required for development to the east, to create a safer access to the school.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Low density residential on the existing B1332 frontage, agricultural land to the west, and opposite side of the B1332. Brooke Lodge with small business units to the north.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Although Brooke Lodge listed building is immediately to the north, the grounds are heavily treed. Extends the settlement northwards towards Porningland, but this is limited by the presence of Brooke Lodge.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Direct access to the B1332, may require speed reduction measures.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield, 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)	Low density residential to the south, fronting the B1332, which may impact on the form of development. Brooke Lodge to the north, in heavily treed grounds. Agricultural to east and west. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site with no obvious concerns.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Domestic boundaries with existing properties. Open field boundaries to the road frontage and the west, which are likely to require reinforcement to give more containment to the site. Drainage ditch and heavily treed boundary to Brooke Lodge.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Sparse vegetation on the road frontage. Large tree in the southwest corner of the site may require protection, as may trees outside the site in try grounds of Brooke Lodge. Large drainage ditch on the northern edge of the site, the boundary with Brooke Lodge.	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, 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	Open landscape, with vies across the site to distant pockets of woodland.	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)	Open agricultural field with few features on the site itself, however it does afford views across the wider countryside. Brooke Lodge provides a good degree of containment to the site. Well located in terms of access to services and facilities, and with direct access to the B1332.	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)**
Open Countryside		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Adjoins the existing Development Boundary to the south.	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)	Being promoted by a local house builder who has built the recent adjoining development.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	
Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Site promoter has experience of development in this location.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Site owners control a larger land holding, therefore additional land for open space/GI could be made available. Highway works to reduce speeds on the B1332 may be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Broadly the site is suitable for development, subject to no overriding concerns regarding the impact on Brooke Lodge listed building, suitable access arrangements from the B1332 and mitigation for any surface water flooding issues. Otherwise the site is well located and relatively unconstrained.

Site Visit Observations

An open, level site with few features. However the site does provide views across the open countryside to woodlands beyond. The site sits between the heavily treed grounds of Brooke Lodge and the existing edge of the settlement; however, the site boundary to the rear (west) would need reinforcement to give a level of containment, plus careful design to create development in depth when adjoining development is principally frontage only.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but adjoins the existing Development Boundary at the southern edge of the site.

Availability

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

Achievability

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable - The site is well located and relatively unconstrained. The site fills a gap between the existing settlement and the grounds of Brooke Lodge; however, it is open to wider countryside to the rear (west) and development in depth to achieve a reasonable density/volume of dwellings would require careful design. Need to consider the highways requirements in relation to potential development on the east of Norwich Road.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

The site is considered suitable for allocation in conjunction with SN0432REVA (east of Norwich Road), with a combined site total of up to 50 dwellings, which will allow an element of flexibility in numbers between the two parts of the proposed allocation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: November 2020

8. Bunwell Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0537 / VC BUN1
Site address	Land to the north of Bunwell Street, Bunwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Application for six dwellings on site (2020/1464) – recently withdrawn. Planning permission for 9 dwellings on adjoining allocation, BUN1 (2019/1542) followed an earlier planning permission for 8 dwellings (2017/0185) on the same allocation.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.2 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(u) Allocated site** **(v) SL extension**	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	The site has been promoted with a range of densities set out: 24 dwellings at 20dph; 36 dwellings at 36dph; or 48 dwellings at 40dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Site frontage onto which access should be achievable NCC HIGHWAYS – Green. Acceptable walking distance to school, should be possible to provide acceptable access, modification to speed limit may be required. Footway required across site frontage. Subject to highway conditions in planning application. NCC Highways meeting - Concerns raised about existing maintenance should not prevent the allocation of a site within Bunwell; likely to be discussions with the highways maintenance team.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Distance to Bunwell Primary School 1km with footways Distance to bus stop time with peak time service to Norwich 230 metres with footway Distance to shop / post office 720 metres with footway Local employment 420 metres with footway	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Bunwell village hall 950 metres largely with footways	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed 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	Green	No identified flood risk **LLFA** – Green. There is a small area of ponding in the northeast of the site for the 0.1% event as shown on the Environment Agency's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		(RoFSW) maps. No watercourse apparent. AW foul sewer in Bunwell Street to the southeast of the site. Located in Source Protection Zone 3.	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would be contained within existing settlement pattern. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Green
Townscape	Green	Development would relate well to existing pattern of development Senior Heritage and Design Officer – This would follow on from the development to west, which already goes back with units to the rear, so this could follow suit. This would be my preferred site.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed Green Farm House to south-east Senior Heritage and Design Officer – Green. No objection on heritage grounds – listed building to south east but site does not contribute significantly to setting HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	Road appears to be of reasonable standard and has footway NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Acceptable walking distance to school, should be possible to provide acceptable access, modification to speed limit may be required. Footway required across site frontage. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.	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 continues existing pattern of development along Bunwell Street and depth of site could allow for small estate development given estate development to south. Senior Heritage and Design Officer comments needed as to any impact on listed building to south-east	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or contamination issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to west and on opposite side of road to south. Agricultural to east and north. No compatibility issues.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries are all quite open	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Little habitat likely to be on site	
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 of contamination on site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Long views northwards across site currently from Bunwell Street. Public right of way on eastern boundary	

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Continuing linear development as shown indicatively on outline consent 2017/0185 would not achieve an allocation of 15 dwellings. However, the depth of the site does allow for a small estate development which could be achieved without extending beyond existing northern extent of curtilages of properties to west. This would could be similar to the approved 2019/1542 scheme.	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	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 single private ownership	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?	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 to demonstrate viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Potential community open space identified but not clear if this would be any greater than policy requirement	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated.

Site Visit Observations

Site is adjacent to allocated site that has planning permission and would continue existing pattern of development.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site relates well to the existing pattern of development and available services and facilities. A suitable access is likely to be able to be achieved. Site is adjacent to previously allocated site that has planning permission where development of the site would continue existing pattern of development along Bunwell Street. The preferred site is considered to have fewest constraints - although the site is over 1ha, numbers are expected to be restricted to ensure coherence with the lower density scheme permitted on the adjoining BUN1 allocation. The site is well related to existing services and facilities and is within a safe walking distance to Bunwell School.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Considering the partially completed 2015 Local Plan allocation adjacent to this site, and the openness to the surrounding landscape, the site is proposed to be allocated for approximately 15 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 9 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0538REV / VC BUN2
Site address	Land opposite Lilac Farm, Bunwell Street, Bunwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.6 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(w) Allocated site** **(x) SL extension**	Allocation for residential development, potential to provide community land if local interest
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	The site has been promoted for a range of densities: 32 dwellings at 20dph; 48 dwellings at 30dph; or 64 dwellings at 40dph
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	Possible constraints on access by existing trees **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Subject to satisfactory access, may require removal of mature trees. 2.0m wide f/w required for full extent of frontage, linking with adjacent facilities. C/w widening to 5.5m minimum required at site frontage.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Distance to Bunwell Primary School 1.6km with footway. Distance to bus stop with peak time service to Norwich 145 metres with footway Distance to shop / post office 245 metres with footway Local employment- 870 metres with footway	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Bunwell village hall 1.3km largely with footway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed 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	Identified surface water flood risk on road **LLFA** – Green. No areas of 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. AW foul sewer present in Bunwell Street to the southeast of the site. Located in Source Protection Zone 3.	Green

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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site contained within settlement therefore reducing landscape impact. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Green
Townscape	Green	Development would relate well to existing form and character of settlement **Senior Heritage and Design Officer** – Amber. I do not consider the landscape gap to be that significant in terms of views – however it is a landscape gap and does present some relief from built up development which is quite a linear settlement	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity **Ecology** – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed Lilac Farm opposite **Senior Heritage and Design Officer** – Amber. This would have some impact on the setting of the adjacent listed building. However with existing built up development, the position of the listed building within its site and its existing context, I do not consider that leaving the opposite side of the road undeveloped is critical to appreciating its significance. On the other hand, with the context of the listed building it should be well designed to take into account the setting of the heritage asset and therefore amber **HES** – Amber	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Road of reasonable capacity with footway **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Green. Subject to satisfactory access, may require removal of mature trees. 2.0m wide f/w required for full extent of frontage, linking with adjacent facilities. C/w widening to 5.5m minimum required at site frontage.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agricultural and residential but with commercial use opposite	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Setting of Lilac Farm opposite already within a built-up setting so therefore development of this site would not have an unacceptable impact on its setting. Views to listed buildings to the north are not of great significance. Estate development of 20 dwellings on site would not be out of character.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Need to establish that access can be achieved without loss of trees on site frontage	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land, no potential 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)	Agricultural land to north and residential to east and west raise ono compatibility issues, whilst commercial use to south not of a scale or nature to raise concerns	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Some trees on site frontage	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some habitat in trees and hedging	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 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	Relatively contained in wider views due to existing development on Bunwell Street and Rectory Lane	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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 an access being achievable an estate development of 20 dwellings could be achieved on this site without significant impacts on landscape and character and appearance of the settlement. An assessment of the importance of the trees on the site frontage should be undertaken.	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	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 single private ownership	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?	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Potential additional community land subject to local interest	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is of suitable size to be allocated.

Site Visit Observations

Site is agricultural land in gap in existing pattern of development along north side of Bunwell Street where new development would be relatively well contained.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site currently agricultural land which forms a gap in the existing pattern of development along north side of Bunwell Street. New development in this location would be relatively well contained. The site has suitable access to a range of services and facilities. Further consideration would need to be given to the importance of the trees along the site frontage and the impact of development on them as a result of creating an access and carriageway widening.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST REGULATION-18 CONSULTATION:
The site has been reassessed with particular emphasis on the landscape impact and the role the existing gap plays within the street scene, as well as the impact on nearby heritage assets, and the impact is not considered to be significant. Overall, as noted previously, the site is not considered to have any constraints that would prevent the development of an appropriate scheme. Policy text should however include reference to the adjacent properties to the east of the site to ensure residential amenities are not impacted. As such, a proposed allocation of approximately 20 dwellings is considered appropriate.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 26 August 2020

9. Ditchingham, Broome, Hedenham and Thwaite Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0373 / VC DIT1
Site address	Land between Thwaite Road and Tunneys Lane, Ditchingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated. Land directly to the south was allocated as DIT1.
Planning History	Land to the south of this site - 2019/1925 – Residential development for 27 houses
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	5.58ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(y) Allocated site** **(z) SL extension**	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph = up to 140 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

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	Access could be achieved from Thwaites Road or Hamilton Way. Tunneys Lane is not considered to be suitable for access. Highways score - Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. Albeit that the network is not considered suitable, accesses could be formed but would require removal of frontage hedges.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Primary School within Ditchingham is approximately 100metres from the site Village shop Limited employment opportunities Regular bus services operate between Diss and Beccles.	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		2 public houses Village Hall 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. Recreation ground within Ditchingham	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste water infrastructure capacity should be confirmed. AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed mains water, foul drainage and electricity is available at the 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. Minerals & Waste comment – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site	Green

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	Part of the site (to the north east) is located within flood zone 2. This area could be avoided however this would result in a reduction in the size of the site. LLFA to provide technical comment if the site is considered appropriate to progress as a Reasonable Alternative	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		Waveney River Valley Site is grade 3 agricultural land	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site forms part of the river valley, however the designation covers all areas outside of Ditchingham and Broome outside of the development boundary.	Amber
Townscape	Green	There is existing residential development to the south and west, however the site would extend further north than the existing built form Senior Heritage & Conservation Officer - Green	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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	The site would not result in the loss of open space.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Site is accessible by Hamilton Way, Thwaite Road or Tunneys Lane. Improvements to the local road network may be required.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential development	Green.

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact upon the historic environment. The site is surrounded by residential development to the south and west.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be achieved from Hamilton Way. The planning layout for the adjacent development off this lane includes the retention of an access to this site. Tunneys Lane would be unsuitable for access.	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 to the south and west. The residential development to the south is predominantly single storey bungalows.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site slopes downwards from the north to the south	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	There are existing trees which screen the site from Tunneys Lane. There are also trees to the north of the site, which screen it from the junction of Tunneys Lane and Thwaites Road,	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees at 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)	Residential properties to the south and west, therefore considered that there is likely to be utilities connections.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are wide views into and across the site	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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 being able to achieve satisfactory access through the proposed development (2019/1925) site is considered to be suitable for development.	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)**
River Valley		N/A
Housing Allocation DIT1	Located to south of site	N/A
Flood zone 2	Small area of land within flood zone 2 to the north east of the site.	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 Ownership. Site is in multiple ownership, however the site promoter has confirmed that all site owners support the development.	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:		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)	No	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Site promoter has included a statement confirming viability	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 represent a suitable option for development. It is adjacent existing residential development, and subject to suitable access being provided through Hamilton Way, it is considered a reasonable option for development. Whilst there is a small area of the site which is located within flood zone 2, due to the size of the site it is considered that this could be avoided.

Site Visit Observations

Site is surrounded by existing residential development to the south and to the west. Access can be achieved through Hamilton Way with secondary access available from Thwaites Road.

Local Plan Designations

The site is located within the defined river valley, however this is the same for all land outside the development boundary within Ditchingham.

Availability

The landowner has confirmed that the site is available

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

REASONABLE - The site is significantly larger and could potentially accommodate 35 dwellings, or more if necessary. The site is well related to the existing services and facilities within Ditchingham. No additional constraints have been identified which would affect its delivery. Although, the development of the site is subject to suitable access via the current DIT1 allocation (which has yet to be started) and Waveney Road, and this may limit the total capacity for the site to expand. The preferred site at approx. 1.4ha reflects the aspirations for the plan and would be located to the south of the site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Liaison with the LLFA and the production of a Stage 2 SFRA have confirmed that up to 35 dwellings will be appropriate on this site, but on a slightly larger area (1.56ha) to the south west of the overall site.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 13 July 2020

10. Earsham Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0390REVA / VC EAR1
Site address	Land east of School Road, Earsham, NR35 2TF
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Historic applications for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Area reduced to 1.25 hectares, additional land included to frontage.
Promoted Site Use, including **(a) Allocated site** **(b) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	At least 25 dwellings 38 at 25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

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	Access has been revised to address previous concerns by including the rectory on School Road. The rectory has been included which provides a wider frontage plot for the site access. NCC Highways meeting - need to clarify ownership of the hedge; need to able to demonstrate ownership up to the highway boundary (hedgeline); inclusion of The Rectory land adds potential to create an estate scale development; removal of the hedge in its entirety would be preferred as it would increase visibility of the development.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Earsham Primary School – immediately north Village has 2 buses per day either going to Great Yarmouth or to Diss Nearest bus stop – 250metres from site along The Street Residential care home – 350 metres from site Medium level opportunities for local employment – pub, jewellers, nursing home, car services.	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to village hall 400 metres Distance to playing field 220 metres Distance to The Queens Head public house 450 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water supply and water recycling centre likely to be needed to be upgraded.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	To be confirmed; promoter queries over the availability of all key services.	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	Green	Flood Zone 1. Await consultation with LLFA.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley ENV 3	Amber
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape. No loss of high-grade agricultural land. A landscape assessment and landscaping scheme would be required, possibly with a landscape buffer to the east. *Previous (SN0390): Some landscape concerns about this site however these would be reduced if the eastern section of the site was omitted from development. Some concerns about the views across the open landscape as well as the proposed pattern of development – a landscape assessment would be required.*	Amber
Townscape	Green	Townscape impact arising as there is no estate development on this side of School Road.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Possible impact on the presence of protected species due to presence of a watercourse to the east but outside the site boundary. Some vegetation along boundaries, open to the east. Would require further investigation and enhancement/mitigation.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Potential impact on nearby (within 200 metres of site) 2 listed buildings. This could be mitigated through careful design and proposed	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		landscaping. **NCC HES – Amber** *Previous (SN0390): More concerned about this site – there are good views along School Road south towards the church which neatly terminated the view. Although there has been some linear development along the east side of School Lane – it retains a strong rural character with the hedgerow. Branching out development to the east would establish more development on this side of Earsham which has historically benefitted from the Waveney Valley floodplains preventing development. There will be views of the church and its spire from the footpaths to the east along the Waveney Valley (Spires are unusual in East Anglia).* *Also historically there may have been some visual connections from the Bigod Castle site in Bungay across the site to the church. Also, the church site also has potential Saxon connections and could have been a camp.* *There is also the setting the listed The Close – which is currently a farmyard cluster setting within wider setting of rural fields.*	
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained with School Road being narrow in places and congested at school drop-off/pick-up times. Easy access into Bungay. NCC Highways meeting - need to clarify ownership of the hedge; need to able to demonstrate ownership up to the highway boundary (hedgeline);	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		inclusion of The Rectory land adds potential to create an estate scale development; removal of the hedge in its entirety would be preferred as it would increase visibility of the development.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	School, agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The reduced site area is an improvement on the previous submission. Although it still does not relate well to the existing townscape as there is no larger development on this side of School Road, there is modern frontage development adjacent and the reduced area could be contained by landscaping. The potential impact on listed building to south has been significantly reduced; needs to be considered by the Heritage Officer.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access can be achieved from road frontage, will need to await NCC Highways to advise if adequate. This area is highly congested at school start and end. The site could offer some potential mitigation to this – this should be investigated with Highway Authority.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land. Will require demolition of the rectory. However, this is an unremarkable building, and it would not be a loss in terms of architectural merit.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	School to north, residential properties to west and to south. Agricultural land otherwise. No compatibility issues	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)	Hedges and trees on most boundaries. Open to the adjacent field to the east.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundaries. Relatively close to watercourses that form part of flood plain	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 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	Largely hidden from School Road as to rear of existing development. No longer views from Church Road to the south which is a no-through road and has mature hedge to north, views from the north from Earsham Dam	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 situated to the rear of existing residential dwellings in an already built-up area. It is next to the school and other services are available in the village. Views to the east are of the open countryside and agricultural fields and there will be some impact on the landscape however the reduced site area is a significant improvement. Access appears achievable through the demolition of the rectory and would relate to the existing village.	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)**
Waveney River Valley ENV3		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation, some impact.	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)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately/Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting 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)	Highways improvements to be required – footpath and access.	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. No viability assessment has been submitted.	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

The site is well related to the existing settlement and located to the rear of existing dwellings off School Road. Landscape and heritage impacts will need to be mitigated.

Site Visit Observations

Access now appears achievable from the frontage. The rear gardens of the residential properties located on School Road would back onto the eastern boundary of the site. There is a good network of footpaths close to the site which extend to the centre of Bungay to the east.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but immediately adjacent to the development boundary for Earsham. Within area defined as Countryside and A5 Waveney River Valley ENV3.

Availability

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

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

REVISED OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is in a sustainable location for an allocation with access to local services in Earsham and also with easy access to Bungay. The previously constrained narrow site access has been addressed by the inclusion of the adjoining rectory and its curtilage. A smaller area was previously considered acceptable as a Preferred Site for a Settlement Limit extension and now, with an adequate access, it is reasonable to include the whole western field as a Preferred Site.

Developing the western field only would avoid flood risk areas and mitigate landscape impact. Consideration will need to be given to wider views along School Road, and south towards the Listed Church where there are heritage assets.

The site can be expected to be suitable for allocation for a development in the region of up to 25 homes on a site of approximately 1.25ha.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 27 April 2022

11. Gillingham, Geldeston and Stockton

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0437 / VC GEL1
Site address	Land off Kells Way, Geldeston, Norfolk NR34 0LS
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	N/A
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.83 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(c) Allocated site** **(d) SL extension**	Allocated site for residential development of up to 12 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified 25dph = 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

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	The site would be assessible from Kells Way and by a proposed adopted highway included as part of the new development being progressed to the south of the site. **NCC HIGHWAYS – Green** Access via Kells Way subject to satisfactory layout. No safe walking route to catchment school. Visibility from Geldeston Hill to Old Yarmouth Rd limited. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. **Highways meeting –** Key issue is whether access can be achieved through the recent FW Properties development. The adopted road stops short of the site boundary and looks to be of limited width, which could compromise the	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		ability to accommodate a footway. If this can be achieved, the site is OK.	
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Gillingham Primary School – 2000 meters from site	Amber
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Public House – 300 meters from site Camp site – 600 meters from site Village play area – immediately adjacent	
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known constraints.	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	All key services are readily available, however there no current supply of gas.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	Green	Site is within an area already served by faster available broadband technology.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	Green	The site is not within an area affected by the ORSTED cable route.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues.	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1.	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Rural River Valley / Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		ALC – Grade 3 Waveney River Valley ENV3 C2 - Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Detrimental impact on landscape could be mitigated through design and landscape treatment. **SNC Landscape Officer -** The preferred site in landscape terms within Geldeston however it should only be accessed from the south (the new development). This site has a better relationship with the valley setting	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Potential impact of the character could be mitigated through careful design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Potential impact on the presence of any protected species, however these could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Boarders Geldeston Conservation Area. 4 Grade II LB within 250 meters pf the site **NCC HES - Amber** **SNC HERITGAE OFFICER –** Setting of CA but not as important to setting of CA as SN0207.	Amber
Open Space	Green	No impact on public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on local network and concerns regarding provision of a suitable and safe access. **NCC HIGHWAYS – Red**	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Located within a predominantly residential area.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?		N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available through existing development 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 recreational	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The land is sloping to the south	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	To the south – existing dwelling rear gardens – close boarder fencing To the east is hedging and a play area West and north are dense vegetation	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Nonvisible	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)	Nonvisible	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site slopes to the south therefore this potential overlooking issues in this direction. The site is well screen to the north Views in to the play area to the west are open.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Site is located to the north of an existing residential development which is still currently being developed.	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)**
Waveney River Valley ENV3		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	The site is located within a River Valley landscape.	

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:		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)	The promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable.	
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highways improvement likely to be required – NCC Highways to advise	
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No viability information submitted to date.	
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	The site has been put forward under the GNLP to include public open space	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of an appropriate size for allocation. The site is well related to the existing settlement and adjacent to existing dwellings which have recently been approved and currently being developed.

Site Visit Observations

Site is located adjacent to an existing residential development which is currently being progressed. Whilst access could be achieved via this development, this would need to be confirmed.

Local Plan Designations

Within open Countryside. The site is located within a River Valley.

Availability

Promoter has confirmed the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a REASONABLE option for development. The site has a good relationship with the existing built form of the settlement and would benefit from good connectivity. The site is located to the north of an existing residential development, recently approved and developed. Development of the site would be subject to an access through this recent development as no other access is suitable (Old Yarmouth Road to the north is not viable). Whilst the site adjoins the Conservation Area, any impacts could be mitigated against through careful design and layout. It has been acknowledged that this site has a better relationship with the Valley setting due to existing boundaries.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

The constraints in terms of the Conservation Area, River Valley Landscape and change in levels on the site mean the site is considered suitable for an allocation of up to 20 dwellings, as contained in the Regulation 18 consultation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 30th December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4078 / VC GIL1
Site address	Land south of GIL 1, Gillingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	To the north - Allocated GIL 1 under existing local plan 2019/1013 - Residential development of 22 dwellings, together with associated public open space, access roads, garaging and car parking.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(e) Allocated site** **(f) SL extension**	Allocated for residential dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25/1ha
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 via The Street to the south **NCC HIGHWAYS – Green** Subject to access via GIL1 **Highways meeting –** Hopkins development (currently under construction) appears to offer a suitable access. Hopkins development includes improvement across the site frontage, and clearing back of existing paths to the highways boundary should also improve the situation	Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Primary School – immediately north of the site. Service station – 650 meters from site Morrisons – 2000 metres from site (Blyburgate) Within close proximity to Blyburgate	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Pre-School – 600 meters from site Village hall – 650 meters from site	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No Known constraints	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Unknown	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	Green	Site is within an area already served by faster available broadband technology.	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	Amber	The site is not within an area affected by the ORSTED cable route.	Amber
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No known contamination or ground stability issues.	Amber
Flood Risk		Flood Zone 2	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		C2 - Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland ALC: Grade 3	Amber
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Detrimental impact on landscape could be mitigated through design and landscape treatment.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER - Landscape caution. Previous issues experienced with the existing allocation GIL1 and significant work was undertaken to agree a suitable landscape scheme given the landscape sensitivities of the site. The site is in close proximity to the Broads (King's Dam) and footpaths run parallel to the south and west of the site. A landscape assessment would need to be undertaken to ensure that neither the Broads or the public routes were adversely impacted. GIL1 has a landscape scheme to the south to ensure the impact of views from these areas are mitigated – this would need to be carried forward if this site did progress.	
Townscape	Amber	Potential impact of the character could be mitigated through careful design.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Potential impact on the presence of any protected species, however these could be reasonably mitigated.	
Historic Environment	Amber	No LB within close proximity. **NCC HES – Amber** **SNC HERITAGE OFFICER-** No heritage or townscape concerns. It would be further developing a cluster away from the main part of the settlement to the east – however it is around the school so makes sense.	Amber
Open Space	Green	No impact on public open space	
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on local network and concerns regarding provision of a suitable and safe access. **NCC HIGHWAYS – Green**	
Neighbouring Land Uses		Residential to the north – GIL 1	

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Limited. Site is set back behind existing residential development to the north east.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would be via the existing residential site GIL 1.	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)	School located to the north	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Relatively flat.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)		N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?		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 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	School to the north View are open to the south – looking southwards to residential dwelllings.	N/A

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 ownership. Promotor is owner.	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	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)	The promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable.	
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highways improvement likely to be required – NCC Highways to advise	
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No viability information submitted to date.	
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified.	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considered suitable for allocation, subject to access via GIL1 to the north. The site would appear as an extension to the existing allocation which is currently being constructed.

Site Visit Observations

The site is adjacent to the existing GIL 1 allocation which is visible to the east as land is this directly is relatively flat and open.

Local Plan Designations

Open Countryside.

Availability

Land available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered a REASONABLE option for development, subject to achieving access via the 2015 Local Plan GIL1 allocation (now Daisy Way) to the north. It is recognised that upgrades may be required/numbers restricted for the highways constraints to be resolved. It is noted that much of the surrounding area falls within Flood Zone 2/3, including land immediately to the south of the site. However, the promoter has advised that the report produced by Evans Coastal and Rivers in connection with Daisy Way, identified the land to be in Flood Risk Zone 1. Further investigation (through the Stage 2 SFRA) would be required to confirm this prior to allocation. It has also been noted that the boundaries of the site can be adjusted if required, due to the same landowner owning surrounding fields. Landscape constraints have been identified, as previously experienced with the 2015 allocation (now Daisy Way), as site is in close proximity to the Broads (King's Dam) and footpaths run parallel to the south and west of the site. A landscape assessment would need to be undertaken to ensure that neither the Broads nor the public routes would be adversely impacted. [*Original conclusion reworded post-Regulation 18 to aid clarity*]

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Following the outputs of the Stage 2 SFRA and further consultation with the LLFA, the area preferred for allocation during the Regulation 18 consultation has been moved to the western end of the overall site. In addition, the site has been enlarged to allow for future expansion of the adjoining primary school. This layout also consolidates the unallocated element of the site at the eastern end. As such the site remains suitable for an allocation of approximately 35 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: November 2020

12. Hales and Heckingham, Langley with Hardley, Carleton St Peter, Claxton, Raveningham and Sisland Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0308 / VC HAL1
Site address	Land off Briar Lane, Hales
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Site below to south: 2018/1934 Outline application for 20 dwellings (including 6 affordable units) with access, associated infrastructure and public open space. Approved 2015/0875 Variation of condition 2 of permission ref C/7/2013/7024 to regularise the site layout and 0.06 hectare extension of the site (eastwards). Hales Community Composting. 2013/2295 - Construction of a community composting scheme on existing farmland, including new vehicular access- NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL C/7/2013/7024.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.21Ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(g) Allocated site** **(h) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Assume 25dph unspecified number of 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	Would not be feasible to provide visibility/acceptable access with limited frontage. NCC Highways – Red, wouldn't be feasible to provide visibility/acceptable access with limited frontage. Briar La is highly constrained and unsuitable for development traffic. There is no safe walking route from the site to local amenities, including the catchment school located at Loddon. NCC Highways Meeting - Previous comments relate to the larger site, accessed via Briar Lane. A smaller development accessed via the HAL1 allocation would be acceptable. Safe walking route to Loddon is available.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	BP garage and shop 654m Bus stop within 359m is on the bus route for 86 traveline Hobart High school within 2.70km Primary School 3.20km Chet Valley medical Practice 3.20km	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall 104m Masala Garden restaurant 340m 1.93km from Loddon Industrial estate Loddon Town centre 2.80km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, 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	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues NCC Mineral & Waste - sites over 1ha which are 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	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		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	Flood Zone 1. Surface water flooding 1:100, 1:30 and Flood Hazard upper most part of the site and around the existing pond in the northeast corner of the site; 1:1000 running from north to south covering the western part of the site,	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B5 - Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated. SNC Landscape Meeting - development of a smaller site would be acceptable in landscape terms, especially in the context of the existing allocation. There may be an opportunity to connect footpaths to Briar Lane. A landscape assessment should be undertaken to assess where the boundaries of the site should sit.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Adjacent to the development boundary. 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. Consideration needs to be	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		given to the recently consented site and Hales hospital redevelopment which already change the character of the village in this location. SNC Heritage & Design - Green.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species, but the impact may be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology – Green, SSSI IRZ. Site near Priority habitat - potential for Biodiversity Net Gain and enhancement.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of the former Hales hospital which is a grade II listed building but could be reasonably mitigated. Site identified as having archaeological records. SNC Heritage & Design - Amber, some impact on setting of listed former workhouse to the east but nothing significant, especially with existing permission to south. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Wouldn't be feasible to provide visibility/acceptable access with limited frontage. Briar Lane is highly constrained and unsuitable for development traffic. NCC Highways – Red, wouldn't be feasible to provide visibility/acceptable access with limited frontage. Briar La is highly constrained and unsuitable for development traffic. There is no safe walking route from the site to local amenities, including the catchment school located at Loddon.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		NCC Highways Meeting - Previous comments relate to the larger site, accessed via Briar Lane. A smaller development accessed via the HAL1 allocation would be acceptable. Safe walking route to Loddon is available.	
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?	Technical officer to assess impact on setting of Hales Hospital. 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.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Wouldn't be feasible to provide visibility/acceptable access with limited frontage. Briar Lane is highly constrained and unsuitable for development traffic. Narrow single track road with no footpaths.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural Grade 3	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)	Land rises from north to south	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Residential to the west, consented development to the south , trees and hedge field boundary to east and substantial trees to the north but limited vegetation	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Pond to northeast corner, substantial tree on north boundary. Substantial trees and 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)	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	Site is visible from the surrounding road network and across the open landscape.	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 application site is located on the eastern side of the settlement of Hales. The site comprises of the northern part of a field in between the existing main part of the village and open countryside. To the south is the consented residential development and the former Hales Hospital. This site is undulating with changes in ground level. Evidence has highlighted concerns that it would not be possible to achieve a suitable access to the site and the local road network is unsuitable. Adjacent to the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village. The site is adjacent to the built environment. Views of the site are afforded from both the highway networks and across the open landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.	Red/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:		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

Adjacent to the existing development boundary and well related to services, with a continuous walking route to employment/services in nearby Loddon and bus services on the main Lowestoft/Beccles/Norwich route. Evidence has highlighted concerns that it would not be possible to achieve a suitable access to the site and the local road network is unsuitable, if accessed via Briar Lane and any access would need to be via the adjoining HAL1 allocation.

Site Visit Observations

The application site is located on the eastern side of the settlement of Hales. The site comprises of the northern part of a field in between the existing village and open countryside. To the south is the consented residential development (HAL1) and the former Hales Hospital is to the east. This site is undulating with changes in ground level. It would represent a breakout of the village. Views of the site are afforded from both the highway networks and across the open landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable – The site is well located to access the limited local facilities; Hales also benefits from a continuous footway to employment and higher order services in Loddon, as well as being on the main Lowestoft/Beccles/Norwich bus route. The site as promoted is too large, but a more restricted site (approx. 1/3 of the land promoted) would be less intrusive in the landscape and on the setting of the listed former Hales Hospital, as well as allowing for any necessary mitigation of the 1:1000 year surface water flood risk. The site would need to be accessed via the current HAL1 allocation, which has outline consent for 20 dwellings.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

During the Regulation 18 consultation it was highlighted that the planning permission on the 2015 Local Plan allocation (HAL1) extended beyond the allocated site and into the proposed new VCAHP allocation. In addition, further discussion with the LLFA indicated that the surface water flow path running north/south through the site would need to remain free from development. Consequently, the area promoted for allocation has been extended to the whole of the proposed site. This avoids leaving an unusable area of land at the northern end of the site and allows for a comprehensive scheme which

addresses the identified constraints. The site remains suitable for an allocation of up to 35 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 26/01/2021

13. Hempnall, Topcroft Street, Morningthorpe, Fritton, Shelton and Hardwick Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0220 / VC HEM1
Site address	Land at Millfields, Hempnall
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.48 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(i) Allocated site** **(j) SL extension**	Allocated site SL Extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approx. 15 dwellings = 31 dph (25 dph = 12 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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development **NCC HIGHWAYS –** (Approx 15 dwellings) subject to Millfields being widened. Millfields is a private road with a minimum width of approx. 2.75m, assuming access can be secured between the site and the public network, the access road will need to be widened to a minimum of 4.5m plus a footway. Visibility at the junction with the B1527 looks reasonable. A safe crossing to facilitate journeys to school should be provided between the site and Field Lane to the east. Improvement required to pedestrian route at Mill Road junction with The Street **Updated - NCC HIGHWAYS -** main issue is the width of the current private road, which would need widening to 5.8m for a shared surface, or at least 4.8m plus a 1.8m foot way for non-shared	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	650m safe walk to primary school Doctor surgery, local retail and employment opportunities within 1800m Peak bus service (450m walk to stop)	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Community centre with groups and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. Sub station within site on northern boundary which could constrain development	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	Green	Flood zone 1. Low risk of flooding	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grades 3/4	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated **SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER-** No landscapes issues	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated through design	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated **NCC HEC - Amber**	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on setting of heritage asset to east but impact could be reasonably mitigated **SNC HERITAGE OFFICER –** likely requirement for limiting height due to neighbouring existing bungalow development around the setting of the Mill.	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/allotments	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Will have some impact on setting of the listed mill – but not significant considering Millfields and the mill have already been developed	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access constrained. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable	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)	Residential development to east, allotments to north, agriculture to west and south - compatible	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)	Open to south. Fencing and intermittent hedgerow to other boundaries.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Nothing of significance	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)	UKPN sub-station on northern boundary near access	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views from south	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)	Safe walking route to primary school and well connected to other local services. Landscape and townscape impacts could be mitigated through design which should reflect scale and character of adjoining)and have regard to setting of listed mill. NCC	Green

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	to confirm satisfactory access.	

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)	Enquiries received	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	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)	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?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is suitable for development for up to 15 dwellings subject to design and heritage considerations, boundary screening and satisfactory access. The size of the site is considered suitable for a SL Extension. Visibility at the junction with the B1527 looks reasonable but highway improvement works have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Safe walking route to primary school and well connected to other local services. Landscape and townscape impacts could be mitigated through design which should reflect scale and character of adjoining) and have regard to setting of listed mill.

Local Plan Designations

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

Availability

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

Achievability

No further constraints identified. SNC has previously given positive informal advice as exceptions site

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered **REASONABLE** as an extension to the existing settlement limit of Hempnall, subject to Millfields (private road) being widened and other off-site highway upgrades. Visibility at the junction with the B1527 appears acceptable, but highway improvements are required for the delivery of development. A safe crossing to facilitate journeys to the school is also required between the site and Field Lane to the east. Heritage constraints have also been identified, including protecting the setting of The Mill, however these can be mitigated through careful design; development should be limited in height to 1 ½ storey.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Through the consultation it emerged that the site being promoted was a smaller parcel of land than identified in the Regulation 18 consultation; however, the site remains suitable and preferred for an allocation of up to 15 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: January 2021

14. Kirby Cane and Ellingham Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0305REVA / VC ELL1
Site address	Land South of Mill Road, Ellingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Site adjacent 2010/2220 - Erection of 7 units of affordable housing. Approved
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Approx. 1.2ha (two options proposed)
Promoted Site Use, including **(k) Allocated site** **(l) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25
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	Access from frontage direct on to Mill Road. NCC Highways – Red. The site frontage is narrow with limited opportunity to form visibility splays and this would be compounded if carriageway widening is required, setting the site frontage further back. Opportunity to provide acceptable visibility might be improved by moving the access slightly west. The promotor would need to demonstrate acceptable visibility can be achieved with any necessary carriageway widening. Previous: ***NCC Highways*** *– Amber, access to be provide to satisfaction of Highway Authority. Requires 2.0m f/w at site frontage to tie in with existing facility and including crossing points. Visibility improvement at Mill Rd junction with Church Rd may be required. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.* ***NCC Highways meeting*** *- this is the*	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		best site in this cluster in highways terms.	
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Village Shop within 600m Bus stop within 550m and is on the bus route for 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston. Primary School within 200m	N/A
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	N/A	Kirby Cane Memorial Hall 700m Recreational ground/play area adjacent to west, within 100m. Olive Tree Restaurant 750m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed EA - The WRC according to our datasets is at 70% capacity and there is treatment capacity for this proposed development. No issues.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	High pressure gas main with an easement restricting development. Promoter has confirmed with Cadent that development is achievable avoiding the easement. Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	The site is 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	N/A	Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues. **NCC Minerals & Waste** - site over 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward 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.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No surface water flooding identified on the site. There is on the road and to the south-west corner of the site. LLFA - Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage. "The site is adjacent to a major flowpath in the 0.1% AEP event leading away from the site. Access to the site could be limited due to off-site flood risk. This should be considered in the flood risk review."	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Extending the site to the west up to the easement of the gas pipeline would be a logical extension between the existing housing and the play area although it would reduce the views from Mill Road towards the Church to the rear. A small extension to the south, as indicated, would be seen against the backdrop of the existing development when seen from the south. This could be mitigated with a sympathetic layout and substantial, sensitive landscaping to the south, visually linking back to the hedge line around the play area. Broads Authority - The site has some potential to adversely affect the local landscape character and the setting of the Broads. I suggest that we ask for the allocation policy to include a reference to the proximity and sensitivity of the Broads, and a requirement for Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment, with BA consulted on the selection of viewpoints. It would also help to mitigate visual impact if tree planting belts could be provided around the southern and western boundaries of the site. SNC Landscape Officer - Policy wording re. landscape boundary will be key due to PROW and proximity to the Broads; design of the scheme will be important - transition from rural to village context; relates to existing development and adjacent to recreation ground and school; improvements to frontage hedgerow should be included in policy text if possible. ***Landscape meeting*** *- Although there is a hedgerow along the site*	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		frontage this is not complete and development in this location would have a less harmful impact on both the landscape character and the setting of the settlement.	
Townscape	Green	The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. There is linear development predominately in the immediate vicinity, with two dwellings set back to the rear of existing properties in larger plots. This does give a notional east-west line which could be the southern extent of the site and would be much better if it was not a straight line but swept across, softened by planting. SNC Heritage Officer – Green. No significant townscape issues.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	CWS located to the west on the other side of Station Road. Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on views of St Mary's Church to the south. Although the view is relatively distant and there would still be a good separation. **HES** – Amber. Possible ploughed-out Bronze Age burial mound adjacent. SNC Heritage Officer – Green. No significant heritage issues.	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC Highways – Amber. Subject to confirmation of carriageway width at site frontage, widening may be required to facilitate safe access. Footway required for full extent of	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		site frontage extending east to link with existing and west to provide safe access to the existing recreation/play area. The 30mph speed limit will also need to be extended. Previous: *NCC advised that the local network currently is considered unsuitable to cater for additional development pressures.* ***NCC Highways meeting*** *- this is the best site in this cluster in highways terms.*	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential and children's play area	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 27/02/22 & previous	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Technical officer to assess impact on setting of listed church to south in the long views. This part of the village is characterised by a linear development form. However, there is development along Mill Lane to the east with a small cul-de-sac which extends development to the south. The density would need to be carefully considered. Noted that the Broads Authority is located to the south of this part of village. There would still be a good separation.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is shown direct onto Mill Road, Highway Authority to be consulted.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural – Land classification Grade 3/4	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat. Agricultural land outside site to south rises slightly along Church Road over the old railway bridge.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging/tree to the north, residential boundary to the east, open to the south and vegetation to the west with the hedged boundary of the play area beyond the gas easement.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations? Monoculture field with low habitat likelihood. Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 27/02/22 & previous	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).	
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	High pressure gas main preventing development within the easement along the west boundary.	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 Mill Road and particularly from the south and from open land to west. 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 be a breakout to the west of the village. There are views of the site from both surrounding footpaths and roads around the site and from the higher vantage point at the railway bridge to the south. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley. There is linear development predominately in the immediate vicinity, with two dwellings set back to the rear of existing properties in larger plots. This does give a notional east-west line which could be landscaped as the southern extent of the site. The high-pressure gas main and its buffer makes a small area to the west of the site undevelopable.	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? (Tick as appropriate) Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Immediately	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Amber
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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is adjacent to the existing development boundary (adjoining a development of 7 affordable units, completed within the last 10 years) and is well located in terms of access to the local services and facilities in the village. The site is constrained by a high-pressure pipeline running along the western boundary, which has an easement, development is possible outside of this area. The extent of the easement has been confirmed between the site promoter and Cadent and extending the site to the south would not be affected by this.

Moving the Preferred site boundary to the west would increase the potential to create suitable visibility splay within the allocated site itself and the total extent of the promoted site allows for any localised carriageway widening/footways to be achieved. Given that the whole frontage is within the same ownership, extending the site to the south, it should also be possible to achieve the required visibility splays. Consideration will need to be given to the off-site flood risk within the carriageway within the design of any highways scheme.

Extending to the west closes a gap between existing housing and the play park and the limits views of the Ellingham church and the Broads Authority area, which would become more prominent with the removal of frontage hedgerow. In either scenario consideration will need to be given to the landscape impacts as part of a sensitively designed scheme.

Site Visit Observations

The site would be a breakout to the west of the village. The site has few features, but equally is open, and there are views of the site from both surrounding footpaths and highways. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and the River Valley, which surrounds the settlement

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

Site promoter has indicated that the site is deliverable, however no supporting evidence has been supplied in terms of the issues such as highways works, flood risk mitigation and overall viability.

REVISED OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Preferred – Through the Regulation 18 consultation options were proposed for extending the preferred site to either the south or the west, consequently this reassessment has been undertaken.

The site is well located for access to local services and facilities in the settlement. The high-pressure pipeline running along the western boundary reduces the development area, however the extent has been confirmed between the site promoter and Cadent and a layout provided illustrating the approx. 25 dwellings can be accommodated whilst avoiding the easement, extending the site to the south would avoid this issue.

The site would be a breakout to the west of the village and any landscape harm will need to be mitigated,

particularly as this is within the River Valley. There is linear development in the immediate vicinity, with two dwellings set back to the rear of existing properties in larger plots. The southern extent of the site could be landscaped in order to not completely obscure views of the church to the south or impact too greatly on the River Valley Landscape. Extending the site west would largely cut off views of the church, but would keep a greater separation to the Broads Authority, whereas extending south would retain more longer distance views, and keep the new development largely contained within a backdrop of existing houses when viewed from the south.

The site will also need to address the highways requirements and the implications of any off-site requirements re existing flood-risk within the carriageway.

Overall extending the site area to the south is considered the preferred option for an allocation of approximately 25 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 02/05/2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3018 / VC ELL2
Site address	Florence Way, Ellingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2016/1247 – Replacement stables and store – Approved 2000/1436 – Erection of three stables – Approved 1990/0366 – Erection of two stables with storage area – Approved 1985/2364 – Erection of two stables and one tack room – Approved 1985/1147 – Erection of single storey stable block of 2 stables and 1 tack room – refused 1977/0617 – Stables - Approved
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.5ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(m) Allocated site** **(n) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	9 dwellings which equate 18 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Agricultural land with stables

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site		The site is access via Florence Way from Mill Lane. Concerns raised previously due to the nature of Florence Way and visibility. NCC informally have raised concerns that Mill Lane is unsuitable to cater for additional development pressures. Saffron Housing has advised the promoter that they will allow for the widening of the road and ensure visibility is achieved. NCC to confirm. **NCC Highways** – Red, no access to public highway, not clear acceptable visibility can be provided from Florence Way to Mill La due to presence of utility pole & mature tree, plus highway extent unconfirmed. No safe walking route to catchment school, not clear acceptable facility could be provided within the highway. **NCC Highways meeting** - although this uses Mill Lane for vehicular access, there is a separate footpath that links Florence Way to the Mill Road/Mill Lane junction. Florence	Red Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Way would appear to be an unadopted road, probably in the ownership of the housing association that developed the existing properties, and the junction with Mill Lane is not ideal. Potential for limited development.	
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport		Village Shop within 480m Nearest bus stop less than 450m is 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston. Primary School 877m No footpath on Mill Lane but from Mill Road there is a footpath all the way to the school.	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall Recreational ground Public House All with 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity		Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure		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		The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field for keeping of horses and no known	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		ground stability issues **NCC Minerals & Waste** – site under 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.	
Flood Risk		Flood zone 1. No surface water flooding identified.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment		Given the location and being mostly bound by existing residential uses, it would have an impact, but this could be reasonably mitigated. **Landscape meeting** - An existing strip of open space could be enhanced and consolidated if this site is allocated. The hedgerow along the boundary is a reasonably new.	Green
Townscape		Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity		Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated. Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston). **NCC Ecology** - Green habitat zone for DLL and great crested newts.	Amber
Historic Environment		There is a listed building to the southeast, however given the intervening uses i.e. residential development, there would be unlikely to be a detrimental impact on the setting of nearby LB. **HES** - Amber	Amber
Open Space		Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads		Potential impact on functioning of Mill Lane may not be reasonably mitigated. NCC informally advised another promoter that Mill Lane is unsuitable to cater for additional development pressures. **NCC Highways** – Red, no access to public highway, not clear acceptable visibility can be provided from Florence Way to Mill La due to presence of utility pole & mature tree, plus highway extent unconfirmed. No safe walking route to catchment school, not clear acceptable facility could be provided within the highway. **NCC Highways meeting** - although this uses Mill Lane for vehicular access, there is a separate footpath that links Florence Way to the Mill Road/Mill Lane junction. Florence Way would appear to be an unadopted road, probably in the ownership of the housing association that developed the existing properties, and the junction	Red Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		with Mill Lane is not ideal. Potential for limited development.	
Neighbouring Land Uses		Agricultural/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	This part of the village is characterised by semi-detached ex local authority houses set in reasonable sized plots in a linear form along Mill Road. To the north along Mill Road again there is a strong linear form of development. The Florence way development created a cul de sac/grouping of development. Therefore the addition of housing on this site would effectively round off the existing development. 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 as there are existing trees to site frontage. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on Mill Lane with no footpaths, which is a narrow country lane, terms of road capacity and lack of footpath provision.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural field used for the keeping of horses – Agricultural classification grade 3/4	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and 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 development and associate boundary treatments to the north, native hedge and trees to the west and south, Florence Way road to the east with residential development beyond.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the	Possibly significant trees along western boundary. As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
site?	regulations? 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).	
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	Will be viewed from Mill Lane, particularly from the south and footpaths running along the southern boundary and across the site below. Contained to 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 village, However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated.	Amber/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)**
Open countryside		N/A
Designated river valley		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/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)	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

Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. Whilst vehicular traffic would need to use Mill Lane, which has limitations, there is a separate footpath (Ellingham/E04/3) to the rear of the Florence Way properties, which leads back to the Mill Lane/Mill Road junction. Although in the River Valley landscape, the site is relatively well contained by development to the north and east.

Site Visit Observations

The site is adjacent to the built environment, with housing immediately to the north and east; whilst there will be landscape harm it may reasonably mitigated. Florence Way itself does not appear to have been constructed to County Council adoptable standards, and therefore negotiation with the developer of Florence Way (Flagship Housing), is required.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside, river valley and adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable **–** The site is well located within the village, there are few on-site constraints and the landscape impact of the site within the River Valley is largely contained/mitigated by the surrounding development. The main constraint would be access. Vehicular traffic would need to use Mill Lane, which has limitations; however, there is a separate footpath to the rear of Florence Way which leads back to the Mill Lane/Mill Road junction. Florence Way does not appear to have been constructed to the County Council's adoptable standards, and negotiation with the owner of road will be required; the promoter of the site states that this has been initiated.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Given the constraints of the site a development an allocation of at least 12 dwellings is considered appropriate, broadly consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 13/08/2020

15. Little Melton and Great Melton Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5040 / VC LM1 (part)
Site address	Land at School Lane, Little Melton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Elm farmhouse with current C1 use for 9 serviced apartments. 2021/1797/F approved conversion from 9 to 3 units Oct 2021. 2019/1756 Adjacent barn converted to two bungalows. Approval for repairs to listed barn. <u>Adjacent</u> approval for 30 dwellings: 2017/2843 Outline granted on Appeal, Reserved Matters granted 2019/2485 and conditions being dealt with. Development commenced.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.84
Promoted Site Use, including **(o) Allocated site** **(p) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 24 dwellings with community uses 60 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	Existing substantial gated access and driveway off School Road which serves the 9 apartments (pp reduced to 3) and the 2 units. Could be shared. Promoter also states access possible to south-east from Braymeadow Lane. Could this be used as a secondary access? Could have a new access from School Road frontage, although this would result in the loss of hedgerow. Await Highway Authority consult and advice on best access. NCC Highways – Amber. Access from School Lane only. Subject to satisfactory access, frontage footway connecting with existing. NCC Highways meeting – Promoter has discussed the site with Graham W. NCC would maintain the position that there should be no access from Burnthouse Lane (even if restricted to vehicles only, not for	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		pedestrians/cyclists), as it is too narrow with no footways and would encourage the use of less suitable roads towards Colney. School Lane access for the combined sites looks suitable.	
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Little Melton Primary School opposite Distance to bus service 200 metres Distance to shop 350 metres Some local employment	N/A
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	N/A	Distance to Little Melton village hall and recreation ground & pre-school 840m The Village Inn public house and restaurant opposite	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	In an area already served with new development adjacent.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified by developer/landowner	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location (Hornsea 3 Windfarm Cable Route lies 200m to the west)	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues but unlikely given that it is undeveloped agricultural land. Would require investigation.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1 2 small areas of surface water flooding risk one near the buildings, one to south boundary and one within trees. Has been a pond on site. Mitigation on adjacent site, similar attenuation pond could be used here; would reduce developable area. LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. On-site flood risk is localised ponding. Standard information required at planning stage. Environment Agency: Green	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)* Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Majority of site: D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland north-east & south-east corners: C1 Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Agricultural Land Classification: Grade 3 – good to moderate.	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is well contained within the village landscape and does not encroach into any open area of countryside. There is a substantial tree/hedge boundary to the south which would prevent encroachment. It has been a green area, albeit private, within the village along	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		with the site to the west (now being developed) and significant landscaping should be included if it is taken forward, including the retention of groups of trees on site.	
Townscape	Green	As a result of the approval on the adjacent land this site represents a piece of land between residential development. Both are adjacent to the development boundary and given nearby culs-de-sac to the east, and north-west a similar type of development here would not be out of character. SNC Heritage Officer - An elongated access will make SN5041 feel very cut off from the rest of the settlement - a long cul de sac passing through an open area with no development.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Trees and pond within the site with potential for habitat, could be enhancement opportunity if water attenuation is required. Nearby barn as well as the trees could have potential for bat roosts. NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI ISZ - but residential and discharge of water not identified for NE consultation. Amber zone for great crested newts and ponds within 250m. Not in GI corridor, and no priority habitats onsite. - adjacent to route for Orsted cable. No PROW. Norfolk Wildlife Trust: Note that this site may be supporting species-rich grassland and this is possibly Priority Habitat. If site is to be taken forward this requires further investigation. Recommend ecological surveys for this site.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed building: barn at Elm Farm. Some renovation has taken place.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Archaeological investigation undertaken for approved site to west because it had high potential for heritage assets of later prehistoric, Roman or medieval times. HES – Amber SNC Heritage Officer - Retaining an element of the openness and a rural connection would be important factors for preserving the setting of the barn; access to SN5041 if not via Burnthouse Lane would be an issue if not via a simple informal track; if the community use of the barn results in a large parking area and access that would have harmful impacts.	
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Located on the main street of the village, surrounded by development and linked by footpath. Well related to services and facilities and benefits from being close to Norwich. NCC Highways – Green. Access from School Lane only. Subject to satisfactory access, frontage footway connecting with existing.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential, school opposite. Listed barn, agricultural, all compatible.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The listed barn is proposed to remain and be brought into use as a community hub which would help ensure its future. It is currently only used for limited storage. It forms a group with the other original buildings which are outside the site area and shown to be retained, this will protect its setting. With the recent approval on the adjacent land this central area of the village, close to the school, is being developed. It would not be out of character but would certainly benefit from retaining and enhancing the 'green' elements here, hedging or green space along the frontage for example.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	There is a set-back existing access which appears adequate and preferable to creating a new access through the hedge. The secondary access from Braymeadow Lane is overgrown and not currently used. However, it is on the outside of the bend with good visibility both directions and appears to be wide enough into the site. There is a footpath on the opposite side of the road back to the village, so good access to services.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural meadow and Grade II listed barn used for storage.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential, including apartments and a converted stable, not part of the proposed development area but part of the same ownership. 30 dwellings approved to west. Access in and development commenced. Detached property (the Hollies, No.32) facing the site access from	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	Braymeadow Lane needs to be considered if access were proposed here. Also agricultural barns to south on boundary.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level and flat.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge to frontage and to rear. Rear gardens to east. New development to west – substantial close boarded fence recently erected along this boundary. Area of conifers on corner between.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees and pond within the site with potential for habitat. The owner confirmed presence of species and the surveys on the adjacent site also identified species present there. Barn and large trees could have potential for bat roosts. All would need investigation.	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 utilities. Given adjacent large old barn and various storage uses would need to check for contamination.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into and out of the site are limited. There are not wide views of the site in the landscape as it is within the village, there are views from the main road. Views to the south towards open countryside are contained from Braymeadow Lane by a substantial tree/hedge boundary which would need to be retained and enhanced.	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)	If allocated it should include wider community benefits as proposed in this central location. It could act as a focus for the village as it is next to the school – the community meadow idea could be developed further as a village green which would also soften the appearance of the proposed school parking if this	Green

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	were taken forward.	

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
Norwich Policy Area		N/A
Viewing Cone		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)	The site is being promoted by Sequence (UK) Ltd, part of WHBrown.	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate) Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Immediately	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Indicative site plan submitted and suggestions of possible community benefits but no evidence of need for these or viability. This should be investigated further.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes – access improvements, open space, other mitigation.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoted has indicated that affordable housing would be provided.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Promoter states a wish to work with Parish Council to provide benefits, e.g. community hub, parking for the school, community meadow, footpath, cycle links, SUDs. The need and viability would need to be considered further.	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is suitable for development, subject to achieving a suitable access via School Lane. Site constraints are limited and where impacts arise these are considered to be reasonably mitigated.

Site Visit Observations

There is a listed building located on site which forms a group with the other original buildings which are outside the site area. There is a set-back existing access which appears adequate and preferable to creating a new access through the hedge. The secondary access from Braymeadow Lane is overgrown and not currently used. Hedge to frontage and to rear. Rear gardens to east. New development to west – substantial close boarded fence recently erected along this boundary. Area of conifers on corner between. Views into and out of the site are limited.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary. Development of the site does not conflict with any other existing or proposed land use designations.

Availability

The landowner/promoter has identified the site to be available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

REVISED OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is well located in relation to existing services and facilities within Little Melton, with the primary school and pub opposite. The site benefits from being located adjacent to a previously approved scheme of 30 dwellings, which significantly alters the context within which the site is set.

The Highway Authority has raised no issues, subject to access being from School Lane only and the provision of a frontage footway connecting the site to the existing built form. The site is well contained within the village landscape and does not encroach into any open area of countryside. There is a substantial tree/hedge boundary to the south which would prevent encroachment, which could be reinforced as necessary. Whilst there is a listed building located on site, it is considered that any impact on the significance of the barn and its setting can be mitigated by keeping the southern end of the site free from development and through careful design and layout of the adjoining properties.

With an appropriate low-key access road passing in front of the listed building, SN5040 could facilitate access to the adjacent site SN5041, providing an opportunity for improved connectivity between the sites and a more coordinated use of the sites.

Whilst indicative, submitted plans show how an area of parking for the school could also be incorporated into the site.

The site is considered to be suitable for approximately 20-25 dwellings but would be more appropriate to allocated in conjunction with SN5041, for approximately 35 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 27/04/22

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5041 / VC LM1 (part)
Site address	Land east of Burnthouse Lane, Little Melton (Jubilee Field)
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9
Promoted Site Use, including **(q) Allocated site** **(r) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	10 dwellings 23 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	Existing field access with gate to south corner of site off Burnthouse Lane. Indicative plan shows a new access further north, closer to junction with Little Melton Road. NCC Highways – Red. No access via Burnthouse Lane, site acceptable if accessed via 5040 only. NCC Highways meeting – Promoter has discussed the site with Graham W. NCC would maintain the position that there should be no access from Burnthouse Lane (even if restricted to vehicles only, not for pedestrians/cyclists), as it is too narrow with no footways and would encourage the use of less suitable roads towards Colney. School Lane access for the combined sites looks suitable.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Little Melton Primary School 470m Distance to bus service 210 metres Distance to shop 790 metres Some local employment	N/A
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	N/A	Distance to Little Melton village hall and recreation ground & pre-school 800m The Village Inn public house and restaurant 510m	Green
Utilities Capacity		In an area already served with new development adjacent.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	In an area already served with new development adjacent.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location. (Hornsea 3 Windfarm Cable Route lies >200m to the west)	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No known contamination or ground stability issues but unlikely given that it is undeveloped agricultural land.	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1 One area of surface water flooding risk from pond on the southern boundary. Mitigation on adjacent	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		site, similar attenuation pond could be used here; may reduce developable area. LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. On-site flood risk is localised ponding concentrated to a pond feature on the site boundary. Standard information required at planning stage. Environment Agency: Green	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)* Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Settled Plateau Farmland Agricultural Land Classification: Grade 3 – good to moderate.	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The frontage along Burnthouse Lane is rural with an open flat field opposite and is the transition from the countryside to the village. It is a little more exposed than the recently approved site to the north and would have some impact on the village edge and landscape. In the Appeal decision for the site to the north the Inspector addressed this issue concluding that there was; 'not significant harm to the landscape' (para 6) and that it did not 'appreciably reduce the open	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		gap between the settlements'. Similarly, because of the boundary hedgeline to the current site its impact is contained and there would only be limited views when approaching from the south. Landscape Officer: Concerns about vehicular access into the site from Burnthouse Lane (urbanising effect)	
Townscape	Red	It would be adjacent to the recently approved development to the north and could be part of the proposed site adjacent to the east if this were taken forward. It is contained to the south by a significant hedge boundary which the site to the north did not have and this creates a strong village edge. If connections were made through the adjacent site back to School Lane, it could relate well to the centre of the village, particularly if the idea of community uses was included. SNC Heritage Officer - An elongated access will make SN5041 feel very cut off from the rest of the settlement - a long cul de sac passing through an open area with no development.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No Designations. There is habitat around the site in the hedges and mature trees, and the nearby barn as well as the trees could have potential for bat roosts. Await Ecologist consult, would need surveying and mitigation. NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI ISZ - but residential and discharge of water not identified for NE consultation. Amber zone for great crested newts and ponds within 250m (need to maintain connectivity with ponds. Not in GI corridor, and no priority habitats onsite. - adjacent to route for Orsted	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		cable. No PROW.	
Historic Environment	Amber	Site of Archaeological Interest to west. Archaeological investigation taken place for approved site to north. Therefore investigation would be required. HES – Amber SNC Heritage Officer - Retaining an element of the openness and a rural connection would be important factors for preserving the setting of the barn; access to SN5041 if not via Burnthouse Lane would be an issue if not via a simple informal track; if the community use of the barn results in a large parking area and access that would have harmful impacts.	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	Burnthouse Lane is narrow and not well connected to the network. It does not have a path at this point. The indicative layout shows a pedestrian link through the two sites. If this were secured the site would be well related to services and facilities and benefits from being close to Norwich. NCC Highways – Red. No access via Burnthouse Lane, site acceptable if accessed via 5040 only.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Approved residential to north. agricultural to south and west. Currently grassland and residential to east. Compatible uses.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments 09/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact on historic environment providing investigation takes place. Would extend the town into the countryside in a way which, in isolation, does not relate well to the existing village. The adjacent development is being built out and this is the next site sequentially. It would need the site to the east to be used for pedestrian access through to services.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Current access to south-west unlikely to be adequate, a new access may be onto Burnthouse Lane which is narrow with limited passing places. Can vehicular access be through the adjacent site? Would need Highway Authority advice.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Grassland	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Currently agricultural, residential with barns, and residential approved to north.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level and flat.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Yes, significant tree boundary to south, some to roadside.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees and pond within the site with potential for habitat. The owner confirmed presence of species and the surveys on the adjacent site also identified species present there. Adjacent barn and large trees could have potential for bat roosts. All would need investigation.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments 09/02/22	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 evidence of utilities or contamination.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The road is narrow and there is vegetation along the frontage, it would be partly visible when approaching along Burnthouse Lane from the south. There would be views of this site as well as the approved site when approaching it head on along Little Melton Road. Longer views out of the site to the south and west are currently over countryside to the edge of new development at Hethersett as well as the large factory to the west. The view of the adjacent site to the north will be of dwellings when built.	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 acceptability of this site would depend on future development on adjacent sites as without these it would be separate from the existing built form. Development has commenced to the north/north-east but it would also require a link to the east. If that is the case it would be in a sustainable location, linked to the school. It extends further south than the recently commenced site to the north and would have some impact on the village edge and landscape. However, it follows a natural hedgeline which contains the site and would form a definite edge.	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		N/A
Viewing Cone		N/A
Adjacent to south-west: Hornsea 3 Windfarm Cable Route		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)	The site is being promoted by Sequence (UK) Ltd, part of WHBrown.	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate) Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Immediately	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Indicative site plan but no evidence of need for these or viability.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes, access, open space etc.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be for 'specialised' housing but no information on viability.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considered suitable for development, subject to overcoming highway and heritage concerns,

Site Visit Observations

The frontage along Burnthouse Lane is rural with an open flat field opposite and is the transition from the countryside to the village. The site more exposed than the recently approved (via Appeal) site to the north and would have some impact on the village edge and landscape. In the Appeal decision for the site to the north the Inspector addressed this issue concluding that there was; 'not significant harm to the landscape' (para 6) and that it did not 'appreciably reduce the open gap between the settlements'. Similarly, because of the boundary hedgeline to the current site its impact is contained and there would only be limited views when approaching from the south.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary, located within D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland. Development of the site does not conflict with any other existing or proposed land use designations.

Availability

The landowner/promoter has identified the site to be available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

REVISED OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be REASONABLE for development if allocated in combination with SN5040. The Highway Authority's main area of concern surrounds any access via Burnthouse Lane, which would not be considered to be suitable given the lack of footpath and narrow width of the road. Access is only considered suitable via SN5040 and this would need to be of a suitable design as not to impact on the significance of the setting of the listed building.

The allocation of SN5041 on its own would not be considered suitable. Internal landscape officers have raised some concerns that an elongated access could make SN5041 feel isolated from the rest of the settlement although there is development currently underway immediately to the north of the site and the site would be linked to SN5040.

Overall the site is considered suitable for 10-15 low density dwellings, but only as part of an overall allocation of approximately 35 in conjunction with SN5040.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 27/04/22

16. Mulbarton, Bracon Ash, Swardeston and East Carleton Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2038 / VC MUL1
Site address	South of Rectory Lane, Mulbarton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	14.635 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(s) Allocated site** **(t) SL extension**	Allocation of market housing, affordable housing, recreation and leisure, community use and public open space
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Max 40dph
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	Constrained roads passing site **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. The site has adequate highway frontage to form an access but the highway is unsuitable for development traffic. Not acceptable. Unspecified Residential 14.67ha. Challenges at Long La/The Rosery junction. The Rosery not able to accommodate 5.5m c/w plus therefore cannot support access. Bluebell Road not of a suitable standard to accommodate development over and above existing. Access to Rectory Road is not able to provide required visibility, sufficient c/w width, or footway. **NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING** – Access via The Rosery or Rectory Lane still not possible as both are narrow with no/limited footways, and already used by traffic cutting across between the A140 and Mulbarton. The Rosery/Long Lane junction is also still a concern. However, if the site is capped at approximately 25 dwellings, access via Bluebell Road should be possible.	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Confirmation after a later meeting that the land owner is happy for Hopkins Homes to promote the site 35 dwelling as an alternative to the 200 promoted during the Reg 18 consultation.	
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Distance to Mulbarton school and surgery 530 metres (from Rectory Lane end of site) or 880 metres (from The Rosery end of site) Distance to bus service 475 metres (from Rectory Lane) or 500 metres (from The Rosery) Distance to shops in Mulbarton – Budgens / post office 800 metres from Rectory Lane; Co-op 500 metres from The Rosery	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Mulbarton village hall and sports facilities 620 metres (from Rectory Lane end of site) or 930 metres (from The Rosery end of site) Distance to Worlds End public house 1.1km (from Rectory Lane) or 1.4km (from The Rosery)	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage, gas 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

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Parts of northern section of site at risk of surface water flooding **LLFA** – Few or no constraints. Standard information required.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Settled Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Contiguous with estate development in Mulbarton in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land LANDSCAPE MEETING – Pollarded Oaks on the southern boundary would need further investigation.	Green
Townscape	Green	Adjacent to estate development which development on this site could integrate into SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green. No objection.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC Ecology – Green. Orange DLL habitat risk zone for great crested newts. SSSI IRZ.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed buildings to north east and north west SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green. No objection. NCC HES - Amber	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Rectory Lane and The Rosery are rural roads with no footways, possible link through Bluebell Road **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. The site has adequate highway frontage to form an access but the highway is unsuitable for development traffic. Not acceptable. Unspecified Residential 14.67ha. Challenges at Long La/The Rosary junction. The Rosary not able to accommodate 5.5m c/w plus therefore cannot support access. Bluebell Road not of a suitable standard to accommodate development over and above existing. Access to Rectory Road is not able to provide required visibility, sufficient c/w width, or footway. **NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING** – Access via The Rosery or Rectory Lane still not possible as both are narrow with no/limited footways, and already used by traffic cutting across between the A140 and Mulbarton. The Rosery/Long Lane junction is also still a concern. However, if the site is capped at approximately 25 dwellings, access via Bluebell Road should be possible.	Red
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 site could be integrated into adjoining estate with connectivity possible. Given built development on southern side of The Rosery (and along Rectory Lane), development would not be entirely breaking into open countryside, although this would be further east than any other estate development	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access from either Rectory Lane or The Rosery would be off a rural road with no footways and would require loss of part or all of the hedgerow along The Rosery and use of an access track in between dwellings on to Rectory Lane. Possible access from Bluebell Road, however this would need to confirmed with NCC Highways. Bluebell Road already provides a single point of access to a large number of dwellings.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land, 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 estate to west of site. Residential properties on opposite side of The Rosery to the south and dwellings along northern boundary. Agricultural fields to east. No compatibility issues	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)	Hedge with trees on southern highway boundary. Hedge on boundary with neighbouring fields to east.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedgerows and 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)	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	Some views across site in gaps in hedgerow from The Rosery. Public right of way bisects 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)	Development of either northern or southern part of site to provide 25 dwellings could be acceptable. However confirmation needed that Highway Authority considers access acceptable. Access could be either through The Rosery and Bluebell Road to south or Rectory Lane to north. Development of the northern part would need to take into account surface water flood risk on part of the site but this doesn't appear to be extensive enough to prevent development.	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)**
Norwich Policy Area		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 under 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?	5-10 years	Amber
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)	Off-site highway improvements may be required to either The Rosery or Rectory Lane, depending on highways comments	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Potential for community enhancements including open space and areas for recreation	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Reduced site could be suitable for allocation for 25 dwellings. The majority of the site is relatively unconstrained and would be seen in the context of the estate scale development that already exists in this location. The site is well located for access to the services and facilities in Mulbarton. The main limitation will be highways considerations, which would mean a development at the southern end of the site, accessed from Bluebell Road.

Site Visit Observations

Site adjacent to existing estate development with potential connectivity. Some landscape impact but would be ready against existing estate development and also development protruding east along The Rosery and Rectory Lane which reduces its impact.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to existing development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is well located in terms of access to services and facilities. There are few constraints on the site. Whilst it would extend into the countryside, the site would be read largely against the backdrop of existing housing. Highways considerations mean that 25 dwellings at the southern end of the site, accessed from Bluebell Road is the only appropriate option.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

The main constraint on the site is the number of units that can be accessed from Bluebell Road, as alternative accesses via The Rosery or Rectory Lane would not be appropriate; through the Regulation 18 consultation the Highway Authority accepted that up to 35 dwellings could be appropriate.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 6 August 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0204 / VC SWA1
Site address	Land off Bobbins Way, Swardeston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Adjoining Site: 2014/1642 Outline permission (appeal) 2017/2247 reserved matters for 38 dwellings Discharge pf conditions relating to 2014/1642 now under consideration
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.6 ha (with additional land available for a contingency/ enlarged site) (NOTE: the original site area was 3.3 ha but has been revised for the Village Clusters)
Promoted Site Use, including **(u) Allocated site** **(v) SL extension**	Allocated site – approximately 25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	16dph as promoted for 25 dwellings.
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Brownfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Existing access to the site off type 3 road approved under 2014/1642 and 2017/2247 **NCC HIGHWAYS –** Red. The access road is inadequate to cater for the size of development. There is no continuous safe footway to the catchment primary school. Existing footway between Swardeston and Mulbarton is restricted in width. **NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING** – 'brownfield site', so consideration to be given to the existing traffic levels generated by the site (former farm shop). Current access is being widened to 4.8m for the adjoining development, and will have a purpose designed junction with the B1113. Main concern is the lack of pedestrian access to Mulbaton Primary School.	Amber (Updated post-meeting)

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Distance to Mulbarton school and Mulbarton surgery 2.4 km with footways. Continuous footpath but narrow in sections creating hostile walking environment Distance to bus service Hourly daytime bus service (including peak time) through settlement between Norwich and Mulbarton Limited retail (home bakery, animal feed store) and local employment in Swardeston.	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Mulbarton / Bracon Ash / Swardeston village hall Distance to Worlds End public house Distance to sports facilities at Mulbarton Cricket club within settlement	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Green
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 identified issues but may require investigation due to previous use. No assessments submitted by promoter **NCC M&W** – A site over 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		forward 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	Reduced site is within flood zone 1 with no identified surface water flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		D1: Wymondham settled Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impact on landscape character could be mitigated through design and landscaped treatment of northern and eastern site boundaries. No loss of high grade agricultural soil **LANDSCAPE MEETING** Need to consider views of the church, which is a characteristic of this landscape type, therefore design/layout to take this into account views from the public footpath leading from Gowthorpe Lane (Note. Particular historic associations of church to Edith Cavell)	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would not be detrimental to the existing form and character of this settlement providing it is proportionate in scale. New development should reinforce existing character through scale, form and materials.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green. this is getting closer to Gowthorpe Hall and barns to east – but still two fields separating the sites. No objection on heritage and design grounds and would be a good use of rural brownfield land. Landscaping on field edge to east should be preserved/retained.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Potential impact on a CWS and potential presence of protected species within redundant buildings (but it is expected that this can be mitigated). No assessment submitted to date. **NCC Ecology** – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development of the site would either have a neutral impact and no detrimental impact on any designated or non-designated heritage assets **SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER** – Green. this is getting closer to Gowthorpe Hall and barns to east – but still two fields separating the sites. No objection on heritage and design grounds and would be a good use of rural brownfield land. Landscaping on field edge to east should be preserved/retained. **NCC HES** - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Potential impact on internal road layout and the local road network (but it is expected that this can be mitigated). No assessments submitted to date **NCC HIGHWAYS –** Red. The access	Amber (updated post-meeting)

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		road is inadequate to cater for the size of development. There is no continuous safe footway to the catchment primary school. Existing footway between Swardeston and Mulbarton is restricted in width. **NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING** – 'brownfield site', so consideration to be given to the existing traffic levels generated by the site (former farm shop). Current access is being widened to 4.8m for the adjoining development, and will have a purpose designed junction with the B1113. Main concern is the lack of pedestrian access to Mulbaton Primary School.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Site adjacent to existing residential. Potential impact on amenity can be mitigated through design	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Well separated from any heritage assets. Site screened from within settlement and main road by existing and new development	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Recent new development served by improved access and new road layout. Access to this site from new internal road. Capacity of road layout for further development to be confirmed with NCC	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Redundant farm shop and associated greenhouses and outside storage and grazing	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to west and south. Agricultural land to east	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site. Ground level rises to east beyond site	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Established hedgerow with trees along northern and eastern boundaries	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Several significant trees around site boundaries. Should be incorporated into any layout	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)	Promoter advises electricity, water and foul drainage to site. Previous redundant use may require contamination assessment. Environmental services to confirm	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Main view into site from development site to south and recent development to west. Site visually contained in views from north and east by established boundary planting.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	A visually contained site that would allow an extension to new and approved development while respecting form of existing settlement. Within easy access to limited village services and public transport. Overall, there are limited constraints and site likely to be acceptable.	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)**
Norwich Policy Area		N/A
Minerals policy CS16	Further investigation required	N/A
Open countryside		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 ownership. Promoter is part owner and advises that agreement of other owners is obtained	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:	Development of adjacent land in same original ownership now underway or imminent.	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)	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 stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?		

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is of suitable size to be allocated.

Site Visit Observations

A visually contained site that would allow an extension to new and approved development, whilst respecting form of existing settlement. Within easy access to limited village services and public transport. Overall, there are limited constraints and site likely to be acceptable, subject to highway considerations.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and adjacent to the development boundary of this settlement. Minerals policy CS16 applies.

Availability

Promoter (and land owner) has advised availability within plan period. Previous employment use ceased last year. No other constraints identified.

Achievability

Adjacent to site being developed by Bennett Homes. Conditions discharged and CIL commencement notice served 23/3/20. Development likely to be achieved through similar arrangement

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be suitable for allocation at a reduced scale to meet the objectives of the Plan. As promoted the site is of a scale that would have a significant adverse impact on the wider landscape. A site of reduced size would be more appropriate. However it would still continue to have some adverse landscape impact. This is due to identified flood risk constraints being likely to restrict development on those parts of the site closest to the existing settlement, resulting in a suboptimal relationship between new development and the main village. Subject to it being demonstrated that a form of development could be achieved which relates suitably to the existing village the site is however potentially suitable. In order to mitigate highways concerns, a development of more than 25 homes may be required.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Proposals at the Regulation 18 stage included a site that projected further east then with the current Bennet Homes development to the south, or the carried forward Local Plan allocation to the north. In order to keep the site to the area occupied by the former nurseries and create a more coherent eastern boundary, which does not sever areas of unallocated land, a revised boundary is recommended, and an allocation of approximately 20 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 11/05/2020

17. Needham, Brockdish, Starston and Wortwell Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2065REV / VC NEE1
Site address	Land north of High Road and Harmans Lane, Needham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(w) Allocated site** **(x) SL extension**	Promoted for 11 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12dph (22dph)
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	Potential access constraints. **NCC Highways** - Green. Subject to frontage development and acceptable visibility, frontage footway widening required to 2.0m minimum. No access to Harman Lane. **Highways Meeting** - This is the old A143 pre-bypass therefore access/visibility etc. should not be an issue, however a greater length of frontage development may help reinforce the 30mph speed limit. There is a continuous footway to Harleston, the main limitation of this site is the need to cross the A143 bypass at the roundabout, however the site could provide for enhancement, such as a central refuge.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Distance to Harleston Primary School 2.4km Bus service passes site with bus stop around 150 metres away Distance to shop 1.4km	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to village hall and play area 150 metres Distance to The Red Lion public house 1km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	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	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	
Flood Risk	Red	Rear of site within Flood Zones 2 and 3, however development may be achievable within the front of the site. LFFA – Green. The site is adjacent to moderate/significant flooding (flowpath). This must be considered in the assessment. Standard information required.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape designation. No loss of high grade agricultural land. **SDC Landscape Officer** - The site is open in landscape terms however it could potentially be accessed without the loss of significant roadside hedgerow if the site is accessed via a private driveway behind the hedgerow (and the hedgerow is therefore retained).	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Sporadic pattern of development in this location. **SDC Heritage Officer** - No heritage or design issues	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Site is within 3km of SSSI **NCC Ecology** – Green. Potential for	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity. **SDC Heritage Officer** - No heritage or design issues **HES** - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Reasonable road and footway provision. **NCC Highways** - Amber. Subject to frontage development and acceptable visibility, frontage footway widening required to 2.0m minimum. No access to Harman Lane. **Highways Meeting** - This is the old A143 pre-bypass therefore access/visibility etc. should not be an issue, however a greater length of frontage development may help reinforce the 30mph speed limit. There is a continuous footway to Harleston, the main limitation of this site is the need to cross the A143 bypass at the roundabout, however the site could provide for enhancement, such as a central refuge.	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?	Less developed area of village, although site still falls within clusters of development. Would therefore have some urbanising effect on character of immediate vicinity	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable but may require removal of part or all of hedgerow	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)	Residential properties opposite and to either side along the northern side of High Road. Agricultural land to north of site	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Land falls away to the rear of the site	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge along part of highway boundary. Open boundary with Harmans Lane. Domestic boundary to property to north-east. Rear boundary is 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?	Some potential habitat in hedgerow	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 across site available from Harmans Lane and High Road	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Some loss of rural character by infilling open gap in pattern of development, however this harm could be outweighed by the need to allocate some housing within the village cluster.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
River Valley		N/A
		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?	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)	Need to cross the A143 bypass at the roundabout to access Harleston, the site could provide for enhancement, such as a central refuge.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has acknowledged that affordable housing may be required 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 accommodate an allocation.

Site Visit Observations

Field that slopes to the rear. In between existing development where frontage development could be acceptable.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Needham. 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:

The site is adjacent to the settlement limit and the services of the village are accessible as there is a continuous footpath along High Road. The site could provide for enhancement to cross the A143, such as a central refuge, to improve connectivity to Harleston and the school. The site is within the River Valley but contained within the landscape on the opposite side of the road to the river. The frontage hedge is not continuous, and access could be achieved with minimal loss. The site area has been reduced to remove from Flood Zones 2 and 3 to the rear.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALATION 18:

Broadly consistent with the Regulation 18 Consultation, an allocation of approximately 15 dwellings is recommended.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 21 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2121REVA / VC WOR1 (part)
Site address	Land south of High Road, Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Prior notification for agricultural building on the site (2019/2530)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Approx. 1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including **(y) Allocated site** **(z) SL extension**	Allocation – 12 to 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	Potential constraints on access NCC Highways – Red, access onto High Road is on the inside of a bend. Visibility of at least 2.4m x 120m would be required. Does not appear achievable. Site is remote from village centre. Access would require 2m wide footway across the site frontage appropriate crossing facilities to the northern side. NCC Highways meeting - discussions have taken place between the site promoters NCC Highways overall it would appear that development should be achievable using private drives. Adequate visibility taking into account the TPO trees will need to be factored in. Survey of existing traffic speeds needed and extension to the 30mph speed limit.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Distance to Harleston Primary School 2.7km On bus route with bus stops 170 metres away Distance to shops in Harleston town centre 3km	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to recreation ground and community centre 400 metres Distance to Wortwell Bell public house 450 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	AW TBC 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 NCC Mineral & Waste - sites under 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then information that future development would need to comply	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		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	Parts of site have identified surface water flood risk LLFA - Significant mitigation required for severe constraints. Recommend a review of the site and potential removal from the local plan.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape designation. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Estate development on site would not respect adjacent linear character	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	SSSI within 2km and 2 CWSs somewhat closer NCC Ecology – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	Road is of reasonable standard with footway NCC Highways – Amber, access onto High Road is on the inside of a bend. Visibility of at least 2.4m x 120m would be required. Does not appear achievable. Site is remote from village centre. Access would require 2m wide footway across the site frontage appropriate crossing facilities to the northern side.	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?	Estate development in this location would not be in keeping with the linear form and character of the adjacent part of the settlement	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways have raised concerns as to whether visibility could be achieved as access would be on to inside of bend	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)	Planning permission for residential properties on adjoining land to east, agricultural land on other boundaries. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)		N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge along highway boundary, with trees including one which is subject to a TPO	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 hedges along highway 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
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from public footpath to west as well as glimpsed views through hedgerow from highway	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Development of the site would extend the village west into the open countryside and also create an area of estate development that does not relate well to the linear pattern of development to the east.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
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?		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?		
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?	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

The site is of a suitable size for allocation and reasonably located in relation to the limited facilities in Wortwell. Significant Highways concern that the required visibility splays can not be achieved as the site is situated on the inside of long bend in High Road, potentially exacerbated by the TPO tree on the highways boundary. The LLFA consider that significant mitigation measures would be required for the identified surface water flood risk. The development would be out of keeping with the form and character of the area, which is linear, frontage only, not in depth – in any event, this site would extend further west than development on the opposite site of High Road, intruding further into the designated River Valley landscape.

Site Visit Observations

Site projects west beyond the existing extent of development along High Road. In addition the existing development of this part of the site is just linear development.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but close to the development boundary for Wortwell (and the small area in between has now been developed). 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:

Unreasonable - Whilst the site is reasonably located for the local facilities in Wortwell, pedestrian access would require a suitable crossing on High Road. However the site has a number of overriding constraints: it has not been demonstrated that suitable visibility splays can be achieved on the inside of the bend in High Road, particularly given the TPO tree on the highway boundary; there are likely to be significant mitigation measures necessary to address surface water flood risk (if this is achievable at all); the site as proposed would be out of keeping in terms of townscape, introducing an uncharacteristic form of estate development; and even reduced to frontage only development, the site would extend the settlement further into the designated River Valley Landscape.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST REGULATION-18 CONSULTATION:

Following the Regulation-18 consultation the site has been reassessed as a REASONABLE option for allocation in conjunction with SN5029. Key issues resulting in the rejection of the site at the Regulation-18 stage related to in-depth development of the site; however, whilst a subsequent planning application on the site (2021/2140) was refused it did not raise significant concerns about small scale linear development across the site frontage. In addition, the landscape impact of any linear development on the site would be further reduced when viewed in tandem with SN5029 (north of High Road). As such the site is considered suitable for approximately 4 dwellings, as part of a combined allocation for at least 12 dwellings with SN5029.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 21 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5029 / VC WOR1 (part)
Site address	Land at Mill Hill, High Road, Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None Opposite: three new bungalows.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6
Promoted Site Use, including **(aa) Allocated site** **(bb) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	6 15 at 25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Directly from High Road. Appears that adequate visibility could be achieved. Would need to avoid the TPO Trees. NCC Highways – Green. Subject to satisfactory access, may require tree removal. Footway widening required for full site frontage. NCC Highways meeting - discussions have taken place between the site promoters NCC Highways and overall it would appear that development should be achievable using private drives. Adequate visibility taking into account the TPO trees will need to be factored in. Survey of existing traffic speeds needed and extension to the 30mph speed limit.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Distance to Harleston Primary School 2.7km, Alburgh and Denton Primary School (not catchment school) 2.7km On bus route with bus stops 170 metres away, linking to market towns in the Waveney Valley.	N/A
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	N/A	Distance to recreation ground (with formal sports facilities) and community centre 380 metres 470m to the Wortwell Bell public house 1.65km to Pura Vida garden centre/coffee shop.	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known constraints. Environment Agency: Green	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter indicates, as far as is known, majority of noted services are available from High Road.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues and unlikely given it is an agricultural field. NCC Minerals & Waste - site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		forward as an allocation then information that - future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.	
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1 Surface Water Flood Risk 1:1000 to west part of site, would need investigating. LLFA – Green. Surface water flooding would not prevent development, mitigation required. Standard information required at planning stage. The site is affected by a moderate flow path in the 0.1% AEP event. The flow path cuts the site south-north. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows north off of the site. This needs to be considered in the site assessment. The site is adjacent to some moderate/major flooding. A large area of the site is unaffected by flood risk. Any water leading from off-site to on-site should be considered as part of any drainage strategy for the site. Access to the site may be affected by the on-site and off-site flood risk. Environment Agency: Green	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	A5 Waveney Rural River Valley Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Would extend the settlement further to the west, into the open countryside where the landscape is more exposed. There are long views towards Redenhall church from several vantage points. The wider field is undulating, but generally flat and lower-lying at the point of the proposed site. Whilst access may be possible through the TPO trees it would alter the landscape along this frontage on the approach to the built-up area; however, the impact needs to be considered in the context of also preferring the site on the south side of High Road (frontage of SN2121REVA) SNC Landscape Officer - Some TPO trees along the site frontage of SN5029; southern end of SN5029 would need to be sufficiently landscaped; additional tree planting could be used to create an appropriate gateway to the village and compensate for the loss of any non-TPO trees to make the access for the site - could allow for a more spacious development with a small extension to the proposed site area	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Follows the linear form of the village along High Road but would continue to elongate the built form. SNC Heritage Officer – No issues.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	SSSI within 2km No habitat within the site as open monoculture field. TPO along frontage; row of 7 oaks and one to south side of road. Access would be through this line of trees. NCC Ecologist: Green. SSSI IRZ but residential and water discharge not identified as requiring NE consultation. No priority habitats onsite. No PROW onsite. Not in GI corridor. Green risk zone for GCN.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets. Long views of Redenhall church. HES – Amber SNC Heritage Officer – No issues.	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Road is of a good standard with footway. PRoW to east of adjacent dwellings. NCC Highways – Amber. Subject to satisfactory access, may require tree removal. Footway widening required for full site frontage.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture, compatible.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No immediate impact on the historic environment but would elongate the settlement further into the open countryside.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Appears to be achievable, if can avoid the TPO and there is a footpath along the frontage.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural field.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Sits at a lower point in the undulating valley landscape, the site itself is generally flat.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	No boundaries, oaks trees along the entire frontage and a newly planted hedge along the east side.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	TPO and other oak trees on the 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 of contamination or utilities.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views are open in all directions, although the road frontage is partially screened by the oak trees and the site sits at a lower point in the landscape. The site also needs to be seen in the context of additional proposed development south of High Road on SN2121REVA. However, it is a visible site and would impact on the River Valley landscape.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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 limited services within the village are within walking distance, with a footpath along High Road. A regular bus service also runs to nearby market towns, including an approx. 10 min journey to Bungay town centre. The site would impact on the River Valley landscape, which is open with some wide views, although the site sits behind a line of oak trees at a lower point in the undulating topography. Any access would need to carefully consider the impact on the oak trees (both those covered by TPOs and those which aren't).	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)**
Waveney River Valley		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Would impact on the River Valley landscape	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)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate) Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Immediately	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No-	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unlikely.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided but no evidence supplied.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	The landowner states they have been in discussion with Wortwell Parish Council and, in addition to the housing land, is proposing that 0.5 hectares of land adjacent to the western edge of the village playing field be provided as a 'dog exercise area' – for which they state there is an identified need in	N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
	the village, and for which a public consultation has been undertaken (on 17 July 2021).	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is at the western edge of Wortwell, within walking distance of the local facilities in the village and the bus stops for routes to the market towns in the Waveney Valley. The site forms part of a wider agricultural field, at a lower point in the undulating landscape. The site sits behind a group of roadside oak trees, some of which are covered by TPOs. Whilst the site would extend the linear form of development, this is in the context of a similar extension being proposed to the south of High Road, on SN2121REVA; the sites are being promoted jointly as an allocation-scale proposal in order to deliver affordable housing. Subsequent to the submission and the site assessment, the site promoter has undertaken further work to help demonstrate that a suitable access can be achieved with either the loss of no trees, or non-TPO trees only. The site will also need to address the surface water flood risk which affects the site.

Site Visit Observations

The limited services within the village are within walking distance, with a footpath along High Road. A regular bus service also runs to nearby market towns, including an approx. 10 min journey to Bungay town centre.

The site would impact on the River Valley landscape, which is open with some wide views, although the site sits behind a line of oak trees at a lower point in the undulating topography.

Any access would need to carefully consider the impact on the oak trees (both those covered by TPOs and those which aren't).

Local Plan Designations

Open Countryside and River Valley landscape, which would need to be reflected in any policy for the site.

Availability

The site promoter has confirmed that the site would be available immediately.

Achievability

The site promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable, with affordable housing provided in conjunction with the site opposite (SN2121REVA), but no supporting evidence supplied.

REVISED OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Preferred (in conjunction with SN2121REVA) – site is reasonably well located in terms of the services and facilities within Wortwell, all of which lie within 1.8km, with footways. The site is also within walking distance of bus stops which connect to market towns in the Waveney Valley, including a 10 min journey to Bungay town centre. The main concerns with the site are the intrusion into the River Valley landscape and ability to access the site with minimal loss of frontage trees. Regarding the former, the site continues the linear pattern of development on High Road, sits behind the roadside oak trees, and is at a lower point in the topography. The site also needs to be considered in the context of SN2121REVA, to the south, which will no longer be open if allocated in conjunction (which is proposed by the two site owners, in order to deliver affordable units). However, sensitive boundary treatment of the site will be required. After the submission and the initial site assessment, the site promoter has undertaken further work to help demonstrate that a suitable access can be achieved with either the loss of no trees, or

limited non-TPO trees only. Therefore, the site is considered suitable for approximately 8 dwellings, as part of a combined allocation for 12 units with SN2121REVA.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 03/05/2022

18. Newton Flotman and Swainsthorpe Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4024 / VC NEW1
Site address	Land off Alan Avenue, Newton Flotman
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.1ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(cc) Allocated site** **(dd) SL extension**	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

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	Access via Alan Avenue. This may need to be in conjunction with allocation NEW 1 – NCC to clarify **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. No access. NCC Highways meeting - the preferable approach would be to continue the priority road into the site and for the for the remainder of Alan Avenue to become a secondary road; developer should be agreeing the preliminary junction design with the HA to determine the extent of third-party land required (would likely need to also speak to #65 and #67 as well) although the current suggestion is acceptable in principle. Needs to ensure there is no overall loss of off-street parking for existing dwellings. SM to raise junction concerns with FW Properties.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Primary School – 900m from site Doctors Surgery – 700m from site Employment Opportunities within the settlement Good public transport access from the A140. Buses to and from Norwich, Diss, Harleston and Long Stratton Limited retail within the settlement.	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Pre-school located within the village hall – which is 200m from the site Public House (Duke of Delhi) – 1200m from site Village Hall (including recreation ground) – 250m from site	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has advised that there is water, sewerage and electricity available.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within 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	No known ground contamination or stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is within flood zone 1 **LLFA** – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard planning information required.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B1: Tas Tributary Farmland ALC: Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relative contained from the wider landscape. **SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER -** Retention of the existing boundary within NEW1 and a 'rounding off' of the field boundary to soften both the proposed and the existing allocations.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Site is relatively contained. Development is not considered to impact upon the townscape. **SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER** – Green. No issues.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be mitigated. **NCC ECOLOGY** – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	Development of the site would not impact the historic environment. **SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER** – Green. No issues. **NCC HES** – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to advise about the Transport and Roads **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Green.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Land to the north is agricultural, however is allocated land - NEW 1. Residential development to the south and east.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is adjacent to the allocated site and adjacent to residential. Development would be contained having regard to the existing and proposed built form.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is from Alan Avenue. Clarification needed from applicant regarding how the site is to be accessed and whether it is intended as a single point from Alan Avenue serving 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)	Residential and agricultural	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site slopes down from north to south	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge along the north-western boundary which separates the site from the allocation. Properties located to the north-east.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedge along the north-western boundary which separates the site from the allocation.	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
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views into the site due to the screening from fencing on Alan Avenue	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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 related to services and facilities. Clarification is needed in regard to the access.	

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)	Site is under option to a developer	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	
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 confirming 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)	No	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter confirming 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 a suitable option for residential development, subject to achieving satisfactory access. The site relates well to existing services and existing development in the settlement. Comments relating to landscape have been noted.

Site Visit Observations

Further information is required in regard to the suitability of the access. There is a gentle slope within the site which slopes down from north to south. There is an existing hedge along the north-western boundary which separates the site from the allocation.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability and is under option to developer. No significant constraints to delivery identified.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a REASONABLE site for allocation, subject to achieving safe and suitable access. The site is well related to services and facilities within Newton Flotman. The site is directly adjacent to the existing allocation (NEW1), where the layout will need to take into account appropriate boundary treatments in order to protect the landscape.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

The site continues to be considered suitable for an allocation of approximately 25 dwellings, broadly consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 20 August 2020

19. Pulham Market and Pulham St Mary Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1052REV / VC PSM1
Site address	Norwich Road, Pulham St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land in open countryside – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	4.03 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(ee) Allocated site** **(ff) SL extension**	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25dph with open space
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	Green	Site has extensive highway boundary Highways score – Amber. Subject to continuous frontage development with accesses at Norwich Road and frontage footway to link with existing facilities. Access at Poppy's Lane would require widening to 5.5m along with 2m frontage footway between access and Norwich Road. Subject to highway conditions in planning application. NCC Highways meeting - LLFA suggestion would likely be more expensive and complex option and would necessitate the closure of Poppy's Lane - highways prefer the original option but no real issues; no objection to either a new access off Norwich Road (subject to visibility and footpaths) or improved Poppy's Lane junction; private accesses/frontage development onto Norwich Road with estate development to the rear as a 30mph should ideally have frontage development on both sides.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Primary school at Pulham Market within 1 km of all parts of site linked by footway Employment opportunities (garage) close to site linked by footway Peak time public transport close to site linked by footway	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Community hall (Pennoyers Centre) including café 315 metres with footway Recreation ground 600 metres away linked by footway Public house within settlement has been closed for some years but remains last lawful use of building Pre-school in Pulham Market	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site	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	The site is unlikely to be contaminated	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Some surface water risk on site but likely to be able to be mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B4 Waveney tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Although prominent to users of Norwich Road and Poppys Lane in the wider landscape it is relatively contained by woodland to north of site	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Would relate relatively well to existing form of development as a result of linear development on southern side of Norwich Road and estate development to east at Goldsmiths Way. Design and scale will be important to ensure compatibility. Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. Develops land between Norwich Road and Poppy's Lane previously undeveloped, however south side of Norwich Road is already developed. If developed through one development this will give a very similar character to a long stretch of Norwich road at point of arrival and give the approach to the village quite an estate like feel. May be better developed in smaller parcels starting from closer the village. It is not a good place for public space being not being very central – and next to the main road.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impact should be able to be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets affected Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. Getting closer to Hill Farm to the north and removing its sense of	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		isolation. Could be mitigated against with space/landscaping to north – but large estate style development will have some impact. Amber but close to red. HES score – Amber	
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Norwich Road is main road through village onto which an access should be achievable Highways score – Amber. Subject to continuous frontage development with accesses at Norwich Road and frontage footway to link with existing facilities. Access at Poppy's Lane would require widening to 5.5m along with 2m frontage footway between access and Norwich Road. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.	Amber
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?	Relates well to existing form and character of village	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Numerous access solutions should be possible given long highway boundaries with both Norwich Road and Poppy's Lane	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land so no redevelopment / 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 properties on opposite (southern) side of Norwich Road. Allotment gardens and residential properties on opposite (eastern) side of Poppys Lane. Woodland to north and agricultural land to north-west. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Relatively level, site is raised from Poppys Lane	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge along boundary with Norwich Road apart from close to junction with Poppys Lane	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Protected trees to north of site and one on Norwich Road highway 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)	Greenfield – 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	Site very visible from Norwich Road and Poppys Lane as large open field	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Site is potentially acceptable as an estate development of up to 25 dwellings on land shown by the site promoter as the open space as this relates best to the existing village. However the site will still have quite an impact on approach to village so site SN1027 would be preferable. If it is decided to allocate the site, then the policy wording could require any open space required to be immediately adjacent to the crossroads.	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	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private single ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately/Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting 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)	Some small scale works like footway along site frontage likely to be required	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Too large in submitted form, however if reduced to area shown as open space it could be acceptable.

Site Visit Observations

Site is very prominent on approach into Pulham St Mary from west. However, development could be designed to relate well to existing form and character and has good access and connectivity. Would need to be much reduced site from that previously promoted.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered suitable for allocation. The site is well related to the existing settlement and the services and facilities within it. Development of the site would require highway improvements. The site is prominent in the landscape, reducing the overall scale of development would avoid a significant detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape. Development is preferred to the eastern end of the site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Through the Regulation 18 consultation it was noted that the preferred site had included land to the north) not actually promoted by the site owner, it also became apparent that there could be more than one highways solution to accessing the site. To address the identified flood risk concerns, a slightly enlarged site (within the wider area promoted for assessment) is recommended for up to 50 dwellings, consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 10 June 2020

20. Rockland St Mary, Hellington and Holverston Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2007 / VC ROC1 (part)
Site address	Land south of New Inn Hill, Rockland St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.55 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(gg) Allocated site** **(hh) SL extension**	Allocation of 15 dwellings or more
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	27 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

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	Green	Access should be achievable from New Inn Hill Highways score – Amber. Access visibility requirement likely to result in removal of mature tree. Subject to provision of 2.0m frontage f/w to link with existing facility to west. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 1.5km Peak time bus service passes site with bus stop 300 metres away Distance to village shop and surgery 1km	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall 1.2 km away Distance to New Inn public house 270 metres away	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage, gas 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 issues of contamination or ground stability issues Minerals & Waste – the site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site 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.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk LLFA score (GNLP) – Green (standard information required)	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Respects linear pattern of settlements, however intrudes into more open landscape. Agricultural soil classification unclear	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Extends into area of more loose development Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. Logical location for next development. Rockland is a very linear settlement however continual linear extension is not necessarily efficient. 15 houses planned here - suggest would say 10-15 with scope to expand to 15 if it can be shown to work without too high a density.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close to Broads and within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar and National Nature Reserve	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No identified heritage assets in close proximity Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Green. No heritage impact. HES Score – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Road and footway access should be satisfactory Highways score – Amber. Access visibility requirement likely to result in removal of mature tree. Subject to provision of 2.0m frontage f/w to link with existing facility to west. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.	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?	Development would have impact on landscape but could relate to Eel Catcher Close development adjacent extending the existing pattern of development	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, 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 west; agricultural to south and to north on opposite side of road. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site itself is level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge and trees on highway boundary. Open boundary with public footpath to east, but hedge behind that.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedges and trees	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No contamination issues	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views from public highway and also public footpath to east.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	If access can be secured (both highway and through provision of footway) without loss of tree and minimal loss of hedging then this could be an acceptable site to allocate, whilst accepting some harm to the local landscape.	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	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?	Single private ownership	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?	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site just large enough to allocate for 12 dwellings, though this would not be in a linear form.

Site Visit Observations

Extends beyond eastern extent of main village and fairly prominent as on ridge. However, precedent for development by adjoining Eel Catcher Close development. Access should be achievable.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Whilst the site extends beyond the eastern extent of the main village and is fairly prominent as it is on a ridge, the precedent for development has been established by the adjoining Eel Catcher Close development. A suitable access is expected be achievable. As a standalone site, this site is unlikely to be suitable for up to 15 dwellings, however there is a potential for the site to be extended into the adjacent SN0531 site to create a larger development. SN0531 appears to offer the potential for an additional footway access back to the main village.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Broadly consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation, the site is recommended for approximately 25 dwellings on a combined site with part of SN0531.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0531 / VC ROC1 (part)
Site address	Land west of Lower Road, Rockland St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	14.8 hectares, of which approx. 10 hectares is proposed for dwellings
Promoted Site Use, including **(ii) Allocated site** **(jj) SL extension**	200 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	20 dph (approx.)
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 may be difficult to achieve **CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE**	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 1.35 km Distance to peak time bus service 200 metres Distance to village shop 890 metres Distances measured using pedestrian access indicated to north-west of site. Footways then available for entire route	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall 1.4km using pedestrian access indicated to north-west of site. Footways then available for entire route Playing field 255 metres using public right of way to north Distance to New Inn public house 330 metres using public right of way to north and then footway along New Inn Hill	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are 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 Minerals & Waste comment – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site 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.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Some small areas of surface water flood risk on site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Loss of high quality agricultural land. Site would also potentially impact on Broads and would not respect linear character of settlement	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Poor relationship with existing form and character of settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close to Broads and within 3km buffer zone for SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar Site and National Nature Reserve	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed buildings to north-west HES Score - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Access onto rural road with no footways **CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK**	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Although partly adjacent to existing built form development of the site would have a very poor relationship with the existing settlement due to the remote access arrangement as well as being of a scale and form that would not be appropriate for the settlement	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access option is potentially achievable but would be remote from main part of village and therefore would have poor connectivity	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural 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 north-west and north-east by mainly agricultural. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Undulating, descends to east into Yare Valley	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and hedges on some boundaries	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Number of trees and hedgerows that could be affected. Also involves a large amount of development close to The Broads	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 or adjacent to site	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Public right of way passes through site from which views would be heavily affected, plus views from public highway	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Not to be allocated as too large with poor relationship to existing settlement. Also have impact on rural feel of character and on Broads	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
		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?	Single private ownership	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?	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)	Likely to require off-site works given scale of development	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Open space above policy requirement	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is too large for allocation of 12-25 dwellings that is sought and does not lend itself to easily being reduced in size.

Site Visit Observations

Number of fields to south-east of village. Access would be very remote from the main part of the settlement, and the scale and form of any development would not relate well to the existing settlement.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but partly adjacent to development boundary of existing settlement.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

As promoted the site is of excessive scale but could be reduced in size to meet the objectives of the VCHAP and address concerns that would otherwise be encountered regarding the impact of development in this location on both the landscape and the townscape . A combination of SN2007 and the north west corner of SN0531 is preferred in order to create a site of 25 dwellings. Development of this site would require cooperation between the landowners of SN2007 and SN0531.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 17 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2064REV / VC ROC2
Site address	Land south of The Street, Rockland St Mary (rear of surgery)
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including **(kk) Allocated site** **(ll) SL extension**	Allocation – 12-25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 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	Access through surgery grounds NCC Highways meeting - solution proposed by FW Properties has the same issues for NCC as access via The Surgery site would - concern about the need for third party land, including ponds to both the east and west, to create pedestrian footpaths, particularly to connect with existing provision to the east (the land appears to be in the ownership of multiple landowners). Visibility splays would need to be appropriate to the prevailing traffic speeds. SM to update FW Properties.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment	Green	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 530 metres Distance to peak time bus service 380 metres to bus stops Village shop and surgery in close proximity	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport			
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall 550 metres away Distance to New Inn public house 1.5km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed 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	Green	No surface water flood risk LLFA score – Green	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Intrudes into open landscape to south away from linear pattern of development, although mitigated by School Lane to west. Agricultural soil classification unclear	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Does not relate to existing linear pattern of development, although mitigated by School Lane to the east Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. There are two established clusters to the east end and west end of the village – with this central area still very linear in its grain of development without backland development. Consequently there are not that many accesses in the centre of the village, and with gaps in housing it retain a rural scale. Introduction of a third central clustered area would create more of precedent for other backland areas to be developed in the same vain, fundamentally changing character of the village. I therefore have townscape concerns.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close to Broads and within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ potential for protected species/ habitats and biodiversity net gain. Adjacent to priority habitat.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity. Senior Heritage & Design Officer –	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Green. HES Score – Amber	
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	The Street has capacity and adequate footways Highways score – Green	Green
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 would not relate to linear pattern of development along The Street heading east from the site. However to the west The Street bends to the south with development along School Lane protruding to the south	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access adjacent to surgery which would be tight – seek clarification with Highway Authority as to whether there is sufficient room for an acceptable access arrangement	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, 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 and surgery to north along The Street, agricultural to south. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Relatively level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and tress on boundaries other than southern which ins 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?	Habitat in hedges and trees	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No contamination issues likely	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Largely hidden in views from The Street due to position behind existing development	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Could be acceptable given existing development along The Street further to the south as the road curves to the west and development protruding to the south along School Lane to the west. However, clarification that access is achievable required	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	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 ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Under option to a developer/ promoter	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	With 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	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated.

Site Visit Observations

Site to the rear of existing linear pattern of development, however pattern of development to west could mitigates for this to some extent. As a consequence there are some townscape concerns. Access by the side of the surgery looks tight and needs clarifying if achievable.

Local Plan Designations

Adjacent to but outside the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Whilst the site extends into open space beyond the linear pattern of existing development there is existing development to the south of The Street, as the road curves to the west with development protruding to the south along School Lane to the west of the proposed site. It would need to be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Highways Officer that an appropriate access into the site, with adequate visibility, can be achieved.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION:

Ongoing discussions with the promoter of the site have confirmed that they have continued to seek a resolution to achieving a suitable access and visibility splays to this site. The Highways Authority has advised that it is likely that any solution will require the addition of third-party land. The site continues to be considered as a preferred option for development in the settlement, for up to 25 dwellings, subject to an appropriate access into the site, with adequate visibility, being achieved.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

21. Seething and Mundham Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2148 / VC SEE1
Site address	Land West of Mill Lane, Seething
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None relevant
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.5ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(mm) Allocated site** **(nn) SL extension**	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Residential development of 12 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

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	Green	Access likely into the site subject to carriageway widening, frontage footway and extension of the local speed limit. **NCC Highways** – Amber, access likely into the site subject to carriageway widening, frontage footway and extension of the local speed limit. South of the site Mill Lane varies in width and there is a complete lack of footway linking the site to the village centre / village school. **NCC Highways meeting** - no footways, but quite wide verges in front of the existing properties. NCC unlikely to object to a SL scale proposal.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Village Shop 949m Bus stop within 272m and is on the bus route for Anglian 86 Primary School is within 676m No footpaths	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall 949m Recreational ground/play area next to village hall	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed. AW advise sewers crossing the site.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, 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	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues. **NCC Minerals & Waste** - underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that future development would need to	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		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	Amber	Flood Zone 1. Surface water Flood depth 1-1000 in the road	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated. **Landscape meeting** - This is an open site with no trees or issues identified.	Amber
Townscape	Green	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 there hedgerows are a key feature. Not adjacent development boundary. Adjacent to a linear form of	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		development separated from the main village. 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	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB. St Margaret's Church is located to the south. Separated from the site by intervening land uses. Seething Old hall and Church Monument are located to the west with open countryside between, with some tree screening. **HES** - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	South of the site Mill Lane varies in width and there is a complete lack of footway linking the site to the village centre / village school. **NCC Highways** – Res, access likely into the site subject to carriageway widening, frontage footway and extension of the local speed limit. South of the site Mill Lane varies in width and there is a complete lack of footway linking the site to the village centre / village school. **NCC Highways meeting** - no footways, but quite wide verges in front of the existing properties. NCC unlikely to object to a SL scale proposal.	Red Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green - As Sewage Works adjacent.	Agricultural/residential/Sewage works	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB's. 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.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access likely into the site subject to carriageway widening, frontage footway and extension of the local speed limit	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural Grade 3	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural/residential/Sewage works	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 to the south. Tree screen and sewage treatment works to the west. Sewage treatment works to the north and open boundary. Open boundary to the road	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.	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)	Sewage treatment works	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is visible from the road network, and the open landscape.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Remote from the main centre of the village. No existing development boundary. 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 open landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.	Amber/Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
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?	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

Suitable size for SL extension, however there is no existing development boundary. Potential adverse impacts on Heritage assets. Landscape and highway safety.

Site Visit Observations

Remote from the main centre of the village. No existing development boundary. 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 open landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable – Although at the edge of the village, the site is less than 1km from the local services and facilities; Mill Lane has no footways, but wide verges, and there are footways on the main Brooke Road (although some upgrades may be required). The northeast corner of the site contains a small waste-water treatment plant; however, the site itself has few features and is relatively unconstrained, and a small extension to the current linear pattern of development is considered reasonable. Allocating this site would require a Settlement Limit to be defined for the remainder of Mill Lane.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

The site is recommended for allocation for at least 12 dwellings, broadly consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 4 December 2020

22. Spooner Row and Suton Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0444 / VC SPO1
Site address	Land west of Bunwell Road, Spooner Row
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusal for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.64 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(oo) Allocated site** **(pp) SL extension**	Allocation (The site promoter has suggested that the site could accommodate between 44 – 61 dwellings, as well as open space)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	At 25dph the site could accommodate up to 91 dwellings The site has been promoted with a density up to 16dph
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	Constraints from hedging, traffic calming features and inside of bend **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Site access likely subject to improvements to continuous frontage footway (2m wide) to connect with existing facilities, c/w widening to 5.5m, extension of local speed limit and review of associated gateway features. 2 points of access onto Bunwell Road. Removal of all / most of existing frontage hedge likely. Footway improvements likely around junction with Station Road.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 540 metres Distance to bus service or railway station 390 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 440 metres Distance to Three Boars public house 100 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewerage network is likely to require upgrades	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	North-eastern part in flood zones 2 and 3a, with surface water flood risk along entire length of highway past site.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would relate to existing settlement in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land. **SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER** - short length of hedgerow; relatively open site; could achieve something to complement dwellings on the opposite side of Bunwell Road.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Within existing mixed pattern of development. Mix of linear and (new) estate development. **SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER** - a large area and will make the settlement more clustered – however there is an argument that the village should perhaps be becoming more clustered rather continuing long stretches of linear development in terms of being in closer proximity to village services. It could also provide a useful sized public space to also serve existing housing.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed house to south of site **HES** – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Site access likely subject to improvements to continuous frontage footway (2m wide) to connect with existing facilities, c/w widening to 5.5m, extension of local speed limit and review of associated gateway features. 2 points of access onto Bunwell Road. Removal of all / most of existing frontage hedge likely. Footway improvements likely around junction with Station Road.	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?	Land at risk of flooding to north of site prevents development in part of site that would be most appropriate in townscape terms. Development to south of site would relate to new development in allocation on opposite side of road but would lead undeveloped gap to north and has potential issues in relation to setting of listed building.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential constraints on access, however NCC Highways have suggested site could be acceptable subject to footway and carriageway widening, extension of local speed limit and review of associated gateway features. May result in loss of hedging	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land, with no potential 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 north and to east of opposite side of Bunwell Road. Single (listed) residential dwelling to south. Agricultural land to west. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is relatively level, slightly higher to south.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge on part of highway boundary. Hedge and trees along western boundary.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedges and trees, and associated with watercourse to north.	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 existing infrastructure or contamination on 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	Views across site from Bunwell Road, particularly to the north where there is no hedge	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)	Constrained site with northern part not suitable due to flood risk. Southern part of site is therefore detached from existing development to the north, although it does still relate to new development on the opposite side of Bunwell Road to the east. Development of this part of the site would involve the loss of part or all of the hedgerow along the highway boundary with the southern part of the site and has potential issues with the setting of the listed building to the south although there is some natural screening. Unlikely to be preferred site but could be a reasonable alternative, subject to views of Senior Heritage and Design Officer	

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
Norwich Policy Area		N/A
		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 single private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	The site is under option to a developer/ site promoter	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	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)	Footway improvements, carriageway widening, extension of speed limit and review of associated gateway features would be required by highway authority.	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 confirmation of viability for a smaller site than they are promoting would be required	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Various identified but as part of a much larger strategic development along with other sites in the village	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

As promoted the site is too large for allocation in accordance with the requirements of the VCHAP however it could be reduced in size. The northern section of the site is within flood zones 2 and 3a therefore development of the site would need to avoid these areas. An estate form development to the south of the site would complement new development on the opposite side of Bunwell Road. Development of the site would result in the loss of some hedgerow.

Site Visit Observations

Relatively open field with hedgerow along southern part of highway boundary. Avoiding northern part of site due to flood risk leaves gap between any new development and existing development to the north on this side of Bunwell Road, however development would relate to new development on allocation on opposite side of Bunwell Road to east. Listed building to south does benefit from natural screening but the impact of development would need to be considered.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable subject to avoidance of areas of flood zone 2 and 3a.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a REASONABLE option for allocation subject to a reduction in the overall site area to meet to the objectives of the VCHAP and to avoid the identified areas of flood zones 2 and 3a within the site (subject to comments of the LLFA). Development would be to the south of the site and would complement the new development on the opposite side of Bunwell Road. Development to the south of the site would result in the loss of hedgerow along the road frontage in order to create a suitable access into the site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

The site is recommended for allocation for approximately 15 dwellings, broadly consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 17 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0567 / VC SPO2 (part)
Site address	Land south of Station Road and west of Queensland, Spooner Row
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Undetermined hybrid application for eight dwellings on the site (2018/2071). Previous outline consent for eight dwellings (2017/1321)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.79 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(qq) Allocated site** **(rr) SL extension**	Allocation (The site has been promoted for 10-15 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	15 dwellings would equate to 18 dph 25dph would equate to 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	Potential constraints on access to site from trees along highway boundary **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Subject to frontage development, access from Station Road, provision of acceptable visibility and 2m wide frontage footway. Could require removal of mature tree(s). Footway improvements required to link the site to the village school and existing footway to the east. Site has already been subject to a planning application. ***(UPDATED HIGHWAYS MEETING 27/01/21*** - Potentially good option for development. Opposite the school, therefore no need for children to use the railway crossing. Supports the Community Council's aspiration for better pedestrian access to Top Common. SN0567 has previously had permission for frontage development but this lapsed. *Post meeting note:* frontage development on 0567 was via private drive(s) and therefore more extensive tree/hedge removal might be	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		required for the combined site)	
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Opposite side of road from Spooner Row Primary School Distance to railway station 150 metres	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 100 metres Distance to Three Boars public house 450 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater capacity to be confirmed	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	Identified surface water flood risk along boundary with highway	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would relate to existing settlement in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land. **SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER** - a larger allocation would result in a loss of hedgerow frontage and potentially also trees further along the road; possible conflict with local character; landscape caution.	Amber
Townscape	Green	A linear form of development would be in keeping with the form and character of the settlement **SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER** – continuation of linear development – in combination with SN2082 it could provide a useful public open space for the village	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	School to north of site could be considered a non-designated heritage asset **SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER** – no issues	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Some local highway improvements may be required **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Subject to frontage development, access from Station Road, provision of acceptable visibility and 2m wide	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		frontage footway. Could require removal of mature tree(s). Footway improvements required to link the site to the village school and existing footway to the east. Site has already been subject to a planning application. ***(UPDATED HIGHWAYS MEETING 27/01/21*** - Potentially good option for development. Opposite the school, therefore no need for children to use the railway crossing. Supports the Community Council's aspiration for better pedestrian access to Top Common. SN0567 has previously had permission for frontage development, but this lapsed. *Post meeting note:* frontage development on 0567 was via private drive(s) and therefore more extensive tree/hedge removal might be required for the combined site)	
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?	Frontage development along the site boundary as previously approved can be achieved without significant harm to the townscape or the setting of the school. Linear development would be of similar form to development.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access has been demonstrated to be achievable for this scale of development through the planning application process (although this was via a private drive)	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)	Residential to east, agricultural to south and west. School on opposite side of Station 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)	Hedge with a couple of trees on Station Road boundary. Hedges on boundary with Top Common and residential property to east. No defined southern boundary 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?	Some habitat in hedgerows and trees 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 on site	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Station Road and from the east and south along Top Common.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Development of this site could be accommodated without resulting in significant harm to the landscape or form and character of the settlement.	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)**
Norwich Policy Area		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 single private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No – promoter notes that enquiries have been received	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)	Footway improvements likely to be required	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?	Reference to footpath to Station Road	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considered to be a suitable site for a small allocation, or as part of a larger site in-combination with SN2082. The site relates well to the settlement and a linear pattern of development (as previously approved on the site) would complement the existing pattern of development. No significant highways issues have been raised although it is noted that the approved scheme was accessed via a private drive. Landscape concerns have been raised about the loss of trees and hedgerow, as well as the impact a larger allocation would have on the local landscape.

Site Visit Observations

Part of larger field where development could be accommodated without exceeding the western extent of development along the northern side of Station Road.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable. Planning permission has previously been obtained for development on this site (but has subsequently lapsed).

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a REASONABLE site for a small allocation on its own merits, but could also be considered as a larger site in-combination with SN2082. The site has previously had the benefit of planning permission. A linear development on the site would complement the existing pattern of development in evidence and the site would have a good relationship with the settlement. No significant access constraints have been identified at this time although concerns have been raised about the likely loss of hedgerow along the site frontage and the possible need to remove trees off-site to create an adequate access to the site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGULATION 18:

The site is considered more appropriately allocated in conjunction with part of SN2082 to the south, and is recommended for a combined allocation of approximately 25 dwellings, broadly consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2082 / VC SPO2 (part)
Site address	Land south of Station Road and east of Top Common, Spooner Row
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Planning permission on land to front of site (see SN0567)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.89 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(ss) Allocated site** **(tt) SL extension**	Allocation (the site has been promoted for up to 30 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	30 dwellings equates to 10dph 25dph equates to 72 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	Potential constraints on access to site from trees along highway boundary if through site SN0567, if not access will need to be from Top Common which is constrained **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Subject to access via SN0567 / Station Road only and footway improvements to the village school. *(**NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING** - Potentially good options for development. Opposite the school, therefore no need for children to use the railway crossing. Supports the Community Council's aspiration for better pedestrian access to Top Common.)*	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Spooner Row Primary School in close proximity via site SN0567 Distance to railway station within 200 metres via site SN0567	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Spooner Row village hall within 150 metres via site SN0567 Distance to Three Boars public house within 500 metres via site SN0567	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	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	Area of site close to boundary with Top Common is at risk of surface water flooding	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would relate to existing settlement in landscape if developed with site SN0567. No loss of high grade agricultural land. **SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER** - a larger allocation would result in a loss of hedgerow frontage and potentially also trees further along the road; possible conflict with local character; landscape caution.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would be a more estate form of development than is typical of Spooner Row, however it is adjacent to development accessed off private drives behind the frontage development **SNC SENIOR HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER** - in combination with SN0567 (although more clustered) could provide a useful public open space for the village.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	School to north of site could be considered a non-designated heritage asset **HES** – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Some local highway improvements may be required for access through site SN0567. Top Common is very	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		constrained if access is proposed from that road **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Subject to acces via SN0567 / Station Road only and footway improvements to the village school. *(**NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING** - Potentially good options for development. Opposite the school, therefore no need for children to use the railway crossing. Supports the Community Council's aspiration for better pedestrian access to Top Common.)*	
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 would only be achievable with site SN0567. This would be likely to introduce estate development, however given depth of development from Station Road immediately to the east this could be acceptable.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access can be achieved through site SN0567.	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)	Residential to east, agricultural to south and west. School on opposite side of Station Road from site SN0567 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)	Hedges on boundary with Top Common and residential property to east. No defined southern boundary as part of larger field. No defined northern or southern boundary 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?	Some habitat in hedgerows and trees 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 on site	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Station Road and from the east and south along Top Common.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Development of this site could be acceptable with SN0567	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		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 single private ownership	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?	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)	Footway improvements likely to be required along Station Road	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?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site would need to be reduced in size but this can be achieved to suit the numbers considered appropriate for an allocation. Development of the site would most logically occur as an extension to the adjacent site SN0567. NCC Highways have advised access should be obtained from Station Road, which would result in the loss of hedgerow and trees along the site frontage. Small areas of identified surface water flood risk along the western edge of the site. Landscape concerns about development of this site have been raised.

Site Visit Observations

Part of a larger field where development could be accommodated without exceeding the western extent of development along the northern side of Station Road or the southern extent of development immediately to the east. No clear boundary to the south.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable. Site SN0567 appears to be within the same land ownership as SN2082.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is suitable for allocation if allocated with adjacent site SN0567 however the overall numbers on the site would need to be reduced to ensure an appropriate scale of development for the settlement. Access to the site would be required via Station Road which would result in the loss of frontage hedgerow. There would be a landscape impact resulting from the development of this combination of sites.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGULATION 18:

Part of the site is considered appropriately allocated in conjunction with SN0567 to the north, and is recommended for a combined allocation of approximately 25 dwellings, broadly consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: January 2021

23. Stoke Holy Cross, Shotesham and Caistor St Edmund & Bixley Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	GNLP0202 / VC STO1
Site address	Land north of and adjoining Long Lane, Stoke Holy Cross
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.3 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(uu) Allocated site** **(vv) SL extension**	Residential development with landscaping and open space (Promoted for up to 20 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 20 dwellings (approx. 15 dwellings per hectare) 32 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

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	A suitable access could be achieved. Highway constraints could potentially be overcome through development. NCC to confirm if access is achievable either via the development to the west which adjoins the site or from Long Lane. **NCC Highways** -Amber. Subject to achieving acceptable visibility, provision of 2m wide frontage footway to link with existing facilities and carriageway widening to 5.5m, along with speed limit extension. 2 points of access. One onto the existing estate road, the other onto Long Lane. *(**Highways meeting 06/01/21** - the majority of development would need to be from a shared access with the recently completed Ingram Homes site (Harrold Place), which will need to be widened to 5.5m. Would also benefit from some frontage development onto Long Lane, to help reinforce the 30mph limit.)*	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Nearest school is Stoke Holy Cross Primary School (opposite side of Long Lane) – c. 225 m There is a bus stop within walking distance. First - Charcoal Line 40, 41 and X41 – c. 575m There is a PH and fish and chip shop in the village which may offer some very limited employment opportunities as well as some existing businesses – up to 1.2km	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall located to the west of the site. Pre-School operates through the village hall – c.650m Playing field, football pitch's and over and under 12's play area and skate park – c.285m Public House and restaurant – up to 1.2km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Enhancements to water supply and sewerage infrastructure network to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known constraints in relation to utilities infrastructure or contamination/ground stability	Green
Flood Risk	Green	The site is at low risk of flooding	Green

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

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

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No likely impact on heritage assets although the site would elongate the village to the north – townscape impact	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be taken through the recently completed site to the west or from Long Lane. NCC have raised concerns regarding the local road network. This may be possible to overcome subject to NCC confirming on network.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural field	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural fields to north and east and residential properties to south and west. Uses are generally compatible with a residential development.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature trees and hedges around site boundaries with some matures trees.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Mature hedgerows and trees	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into and out of the site from the north and east will likely have an impact on the rural landscape character. Impact on the valley setting.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the rural landscape valley. However the site appears to form a logical extension to the existing settlement in this location.	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	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private single ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately/Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting information from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Possible upgrades to water supply and foul water network. Off-site highway improvement works would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed delivery but no additional evidence submitted at this time	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None proposed as part of the site promotion	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

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

Site Visit Observations

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

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

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

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Revaluating the site following the Regulation 18 consultation, the northern boundary has been redrawn to align with the boundary of Harrold Place to the west. The slightly enlarged site will allow for a proportion of single-storey dwellings, for residential amenity and landscape reasons, and is recommended for allocation for up to 25 dwellings, consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 31 July 2020

24. Tacolneston and Forncett End Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1057 / VC TAC1
Site address	Land to the west of Norwich Road, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2016/2635 – 3 self-build plots at front of site adjacent Norwich Road – Outline allowed at appeal - extant permission 10/05/21. Only small part of site.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.2ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(ww) Allocated site** **(xx) SL extension**	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph (80 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Predominantly greenfield – part brownfield as the site includes a dwelling and buildings associated with Hill Top Farm

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 to the site is available from Norwich Road. **NCC Highways** – Amber. Access likely to require removal of frontage hedge. Subject to 2m wide frontage footway (linking to existing provision to the north) along with suitable crossing to existing facility at east side of Norwich Road. **NCC Meeting:** Considered difficult to provide a satisfactory access without losing trees and hedges, particularly if a footway is to be provided on the west side of Norwich Road. Would potentially need a crossing facility to the school – which would help provide a speed calming measure.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Primary school – 190m from the site Public transport provision with a service to Norwich	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ 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	Waste-water infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that mains water, sewerage and electricity are 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 contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1 **LFFA** – Green. Few or no constraints	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		E1: Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Grade 3 agricultural land Development would represent a breakout to the west of the village. This would have a negative impact on the landscape It is not considered that this could be mitigated. **SDC Landscape Officer** - Impact on townscape through eroding significant gap/green lung between two distinct parts of the settlement.	Red
Townscape	Amber	Development of the site would represent a break-out to the west of the village and not reflect the existing pattern of development. The proposal is considered to have a negative impact on the townscape which is not considered can be reasonably mitigated through design.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development would be reasonably mitigated – note ponds on existing residential site **NCC Ecology** - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain. Need to maintain pond connectivity.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	The proposal is not considered to impact on the historic environment. **HES** - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of designated open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	Access would be from the B1113. There are existing footpaths on the opposite side of Norwich Road. **NCC Highways** – Amber. Access likely to require removal of frontage hedge. Subject to 2m wide frontage footway (linking to existing provision to the north) along with suitable crossing to existing facility at east side of Norwich Road. **NCC Meeting:** Considered difficult to provide a satisfactory access without losing trees and hedges, particularly if a footway is to be provided on the west side of Norwich Road. Would potentially need a crossing facility to the school – which would help provide a speed calming measure.	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 result in the break-out of development to the west of Tacolneston which does not reflect the form and character of the area. Development of the site would erode a clear gap between the two sections of the settlement.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available from Norwich Road	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural. There are a number of existing farm buildings within the site.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and 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)	The western boundary includes a hedgerow adjacent to the public footpath.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	The site is open with views across it. There are significant trees located within the centre of the site which are visible within the landscape. The proposal will result in a break-out of development which would negatively impact on the landscape.	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)	Electricity and telephone wires cross part of the site connecting the existing buildings	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are open views both within the site and across it to the west.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Development of the site would negatively impact on both the landscape and townscape.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
TPO	At front of site adjacent to Norwich Road.	N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations	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)	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)	Footway required on the west side of Norwich Road and would potentially need a crossing facility to the school	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 ha snot provided additional supporting evidence at this time.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	An area of public parkland is proposed to the south-east of the site	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considered to be excessive in scale but could be reduced in size to meet the objectives of the VCHAP. The site is located within a gap between two distinctly separate sections of the settlement and would result in the loss of a significant green gap in the townscape. Townscape, landscape and highways concerns have been raised and TPOs are noted along the site frontage.

Site Visit Observations

The site provides open views across the wider countryside. Development would result in a break-out to the west which would not reflect the form and character of the area and negatively impact on the landscape and townscape. It is not considered that this could be mitigated through design.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised that the site is available within the plan period.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is excessive in scale but could be reduced in size to meet the objectives of the VCHAP. The site is within a sustainable location and relates well to existing development to the north of the settlement. Development of the site would be limited to the top section of the site only in order to reduce the landscape and townscape impact of new development in this location. Creation of an adequate access would require the removal of existing vegetation and trees along the site frontage and some additional highways safety works may be required to support the development of this site. The trees at the front of the site are subject to TPOs. Consideration would need to be given to the form of development on this site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGULATION 18:

Through the Regulation 18 consultation both the areas north and south of the access drive were included for an allocation of up to 20 dwellings. This site included an area which already had permission for three dwellings, on the frontage of the southern part of the site, which needs to be removed from the allocation. The site promoter has provided a site layout which indicates that 25 dwellings can be accommodated, albeit with a mix of units that focuses on one and two bed properties. As such, the site is recommended for allocation of up to 25 units, depending on the mix of units proposed.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

25. Tasburgh Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4079 / VC TAS1
Site address	Land north of Church Road and west of Tasburgh School, Tasburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Allocated site (TAS1)
Planning History	Currently allocated as TAS 1. Applicants are seeking to increase the density of dwellings on the site.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(yy) Allocated site** **(zz) SL extension**	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	35 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

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	n/a	Access is available from Church Road **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Subject to access at both Church Rd & Henry Preston Rd with continuous link between, widening at Church Rd frontage to a minimum 5.5m and provision of 2.0m frontage footway at Church Road to link with existing facility to east.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	n/a	Primary School – Located directly to the south east of the site. Employment opportunities within settlement, however these are limited. Regular bus service from the A140 between settlement and Norwich, Long Stratton, Diss and Harleston No doctors surgery – nearest is Newton Flotman or Long Stratton	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Public house Village Hall – 500m from the site Recreation ground in settlement	
Utilities Capacity	n/a	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	n/a	Promoter advises water and electricity available to the site. They are unsure if there is mains drainage	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within 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	n/a	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	n/a	Site is located within flood zone 1 **LLFA** – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B1: Tas Tributary Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	n/a	COUNCIL LANDSCAPE OFFICER: Although this site is on the cusp of the valley there are no significant landscape features The site is well contained within the existing landscape. Subject to a suitable design solution it is not considered to impact upon the landscape.	Green
Townscape	n/a	Development of the site would reflect the existing development pattern **SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER** –Amber. No objection in principle however suggest a lower number in the allocation.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	n/a	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated **NCC ECOLOGY** – Green. SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to Priority Habitat - Deciduous woodland. Potential for protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	n/a	Site is located to the south east of a scheduled monument. Development should respect its setting **SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER** – No objection in principle however suggest a lower number in the allocation. **NCC HES** – Amber	Amber
Open Space	n/a	Site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	n/a	Site is accessed from Church Road **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Subject to access at both Church Rd & Henry Preston Rd with continuous link between, widening at Church Rd frontage to a minimum 5.5m and provision of 2.0m frontage footway at Church Road to link with existing	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		facility to east.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	n/a	Residential to the south east and west. The primary school is also located to the east.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is well contained within the existing townscape. Development is not considered to have an adverse impact.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available from Church Road.	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. Primary school is also located to the south of the site.	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)	Limited boundary treatments. There are trees located on the eastern boundary.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No	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
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site from Church road. Site is well contained and there aren't wider views.	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)	Site is considered a suitable option for development.	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)**
Allocation TAS 1		N/A
Yare Tas River Valleys ENV3		N/A
Area of special advertisement Control		N/A
RAF Old Buckenham Safeguard zone		N/A
Development Boundary		N/A
Conclusion	Site is located within the development boundary and currently allocated for residential development	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)	Yes	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)	No	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoted has set out that the increase in density on the site is required to ensure its viability. No additional information is provided to support this.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is currently allocated (TAS1) and it is considered that it remains a suitable option for development, subject to achieving a suitable density and providing a satisfactory access.

Site Visit Observations

Site is currently being marketed. Site is well related to services and facilities within Tasburgh.

Local Plan Designations

Site frontage is located within the River Valley. Majority of the site is tributary farmland.

Availability

Site is being actively marketed under the current allocation (TAS1).

Achievability

No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be REASONABLE for development. The applicants are seeking to increase the density of the site from what it is currently allocated for under 2015 Local Plan allocation TAS1. Whilst the site is still considered a reasonable option for delivery, the original allocation required consideration of school expansion which would require land from this site. Confirmation would be needed from NCC Education that this is no longer the case if the density is to be increased. Highways would also require highway improvement works and a road linking Church Road and Henry Preston Road.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGULATION 18:

After the Regulation 18 consultation a planning application (2022/0087) for 34 dwellings on the site has been considered and refused. Further consideration has also been given to retaining land for expansion of the school. As such, the site is still regarded as suitable for an uplift in dwellings, over and above the 2015 allocation, but this is now considered more appropriate as an allocation for approximately 25 units, an uplift of five.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 13 August 2020

26. Thurlton and Norton Subcourse Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5025 / VC THU1
Site address	Land north of Blacksmiths Gardens, Thurlton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None Adjacent to allocation THL1 which has been constructed under ref: 2017/2302 for 30 dwellings
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.07
Promoted Site Use, including **(aaa) Allocated site** **(bbb) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25 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	Showing long track to frontage with Beccles Road as access. This narrows along its length. Would be preferable to access through the adjacent site's cul-de-sac at Blacksmith's Gardens or from (Links Way not possible). NCC Highways – Red. Access to an adoptable standard does not appear feasible. **Correspondence with the promoter** – the site onwer has retained access rights through the adjacent Blacksmith's Gardens development. NCC Highways meeting - SN5025 - developer of adjacent site has created a Type 6 road partway along Blacksmiths Gardens, which is only suitable for 25 dwellings (it already serves c. 13 dwellings) - this site is therefore only achievable for a maximum of 15 dwelling; access via Beccles Road is not possible and an upgrade to Blacksmiths Gardens unlikely to be possible REDUCTION	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		OF NUMBERS ON SITE TO 15	
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Village Shop 275m Bus stop within 100m is on the bus route for 86 traveline Primary School 825m, closer if using PRoW across field.	N/A
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	N/A	Village Hall and associated Recreational ground 500m Public House 575m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known constraints. In catchment for the Norton Subcourse Water Recycling Centre. Environment Agency: Green	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises it has utilities due to proximity with existing development, mains sewerage in roadway.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	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 majority of the site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field, would need details of use and construction of buildings on site. No known ground stability issues. Minerals & Waste: Safeguarding area (sand and gravel). Site over 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward 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.	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1 with small areas of very low risk surface water flooding to south of site, near to existing buildings. LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. On-site flood risk is localised ponding. The site is within proximity of two known records of anecdotal/external flooding on Beccles Road. We advise this is considered in the site assessment. Environment Agency: Green	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3. Appears it could be or is close to Grade 2.	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Because of recent development to the south there would be minimal impact on the landscape which could be mitigated. It does not encroach further into the countryside. Broads Authority: 500m from BA boundary. Thurlton settlement intervening so unlikely to present issues. SNC Landscape Officer - PROW along the boundary - policy wording to refer to keeping an open frontage to the public access (footpath); limited landscape impact of the site; boundary treatments to be considered and secured by policy.	Green
Townscape	Green	The site largely infills between existing development on two sides and the recently built allocated site. There are already several cul-de-sac surrounding and this site would be similar, with no negative impact on the townscape. In terms of relating to existing development it would be preferable to access through adjacent site at Blacksmith's Gardens. This would encourage permeability and link to existing footpaths.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations, and it is an agricultural field with few natural features - unlikely to have a significant impact on habitats or species. NCC Ecologist: Green. PROW Thurlton FP3 runs along the	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		edge of the site (PROW should be consulted as proposed access along PROW). SSSI IRZ - NE require consultation if there is to be any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m³/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream. Not in GI corridor. Green risk zone for great crested newts. No priority habitats onsite (see MAGIC).	
Historic Environment	Amber	There are no nearby listed buildings or conservation areas. The adjacent site has had some archaeological finds but of limited significance, it would need similar investigation on this site. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Highways unlikely to raise an objection in terms of functioning of the local road network. Thurlton FP3 runs along the south-east – this could be compatible with the proposed access and would need to be taken into account. NCC Highways – Red. Access to an adoptable standard does not appear feasible. NCC Highways meeting - SN5025 - developer of adjacent site has created a Type 6 road partway along Blacksmiths Gardens, which is only suitable for 25 dwellings (it already serves c. 13 dwellings) - this site is therefore only achievable for a maximum of 15 dwelling; access via Beccles Road is not possible and an upgrade to Blacksmiths Gardens unlikely to be possible REDUCTION OF NUMBERS ON SITE TO 15	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Recent residential development to south-east, existing dwellings to south-west, agricultural to north. Compatible uses.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No negative impact on historic environment or townscape, it is infilling the development boundary.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	May be achievable, highway authority would need to advise on visibility splays and width of road. Also need to consider impact on public footpath, could the footpath be improved to link to the school?	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural – no issues. Would require removal of existing buildings and checking for contamination/ asbestos.	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 with slope east-west towards higher point at rear.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open on two sides with residential back gardens on two sides.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	None evident.	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)	None evident.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Relatively contained therefore limited public views into the site, views from existing dwellings towards site.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	It is well connected to services and well related to the existing village. Do not appear to be any significant constraints which would prevent development. Access needs to be considered and impact on footpath.	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)**
None		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No – has made site available and enquiries received.	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Promoter has stated that the site is deliverable but no evidence submitted.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Access improvements, likely open space required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter indicated that the landowner would provide it on site.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is well located in terms of distance to the services/facilities available locally. The site is immediately north-west of the recently completed Blacksmiths Garden development, on the THL1 allocation in the 2015 Local Plan; as such, the site would be relatively well contained in terms of landscape and townscape impacts. The initial access proposed for the site was via a narrow lane, direct to Beccles Road, which would not have been suitable to support an allocation scale development; however, the site promoter has subsequently confirmed that the landowner has retained access rights through Blacksmiths Garden. Consideration would need to be given to the single-storey development on Blacksmiths Garden, Links Way and Meadow Close, which adjoin the site, as well as to the PRoW running along the south-eastern boundary.

Site Visit Observations

It is well connected to services and well related to the existing village. Do not appear to be any significant constraints which would prevent development.

Access needs to be considered and impact on footpath.

Local Plan Designations

Open Countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability

The promoter has indicated that the site is available immediately and there has been interest.

Achievability

The promoter has indicated that the site is deliverable, but has not provided any supporting evidence.

REVISED OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Preferred - The site is well located in terms of the distance to local services, and, with the construction of Blacksmiths Gardens on the 2015 Local Plan THL1 allocation adjacent, the site would have limited impact on the landscape and townscape in the vicinity. The initial proposal was constrained by the narrow access onto Beccles Road, which is also a PRoW, but the site promoter has subsequently confirmed that access rights to use Blacksmiths Gardens have been retained. However, the Highways Authority has advised that the numbers of dwellings achievable on this site may be constrained by the existing standard of road at Blacksmiths Gardens (particularly regarding the lack of separate footway). Consideration will need to be given to the single-storey dwellings on both the north-west and south-east boundaries of the site as well as the numbers that could be accommodated on the site. Given the Highways limitations, the site is considered suitable for an allocation of at least 12 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 02/05/2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0149 / VC THU2
Site address	Land adjacent to Holly Cottage, West of Beccles Road, Thurlton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2018/2594 O/L for up to 7 dwellings, drainage, external works and associated infrastructure. Withdrawn. 2018/2593 3 dwellings (additional plots 6-8)& garages. Withdrawn <u>Adjacent site (in SL)</u> 2016/2904 5 detached dwellings and garages. Full PP Approved. **Included in SL: 1 built**. 2011/0999 5 dwellings & garages and access road. Approved 1988/2247 3 Houses and Garages on Approved Building Plots (07/87/1253/O). Approved 1987/1253 Development of Site For 3 Building Plots with new Access to Existing Cottage from Beccles Road. Approved.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.51Ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(ccc) Allocated site** **(ddd) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approximately 15 dwellings – assume 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	NCC Highways comments to 2018/2594 (comparable to the proposed site): The scale of development proposed would require an adoptable standard road. Furthermore, the applicant has not demonstrated that adequate visibility splays can be provided at the junction with Beccles Road. **NCC Highways** - Amber. Access would need to demonstrate acceptable access visibility (2.4m x 59m) and adequate links to existing footways. NCC Highways meeting - Proposed access drawing for 15 dwellings are acceptable in principle; redrawing the site with a perpendicular access addresses some of the issues of the previous scheme; policy to state no access via Sandy Lane.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Village Shop 278m Bus stop within 89m is on the bus route for 86 traveline Primary School 809m	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall and associated Recreational ground 497m Public House 572m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, 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	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues. **NCC Minerals** – site under 1ha which is 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	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1, Flood zones 2 and 3 lie close to western boundary where there is a surface water flow path. Surface Water flooding in the southern tip part of the site. **LFFA** – Few or no constraints. Some areas of surface water risk identified 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 east of the site up to 0.6m in depth. Watercourse is apparent on DRN mapping to the West of the site (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. Part of the site is within the Waveney Lower Yare and Lothingland Internal Drainage Board.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		C2 - Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated. Consideration needs to be given to	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		the proximity to the Broads. **SDC Landscape Officer** - The site is well contained and screened and would be acceptable, however likely numbers achievable on the site could reduce the site to a SL extension rather than an allocation. Consideration to be given to the retention of existing vegetation.	
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. Adjacent to the development boundary and a small development of 5 dwellings which an access is proposed via. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated. Noted the proximity to the Broads. **NCC Ecology** – Green. Land adjacent to priority habitat - Good quality semi-improved grassland (Non Priority). SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not have detrimental impact on setting of any of the LB located in the vicinity. **HES** - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Highways have not raised an objection in terms of functioning of the local road network but adequate links to existing footways will need to	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		be provided. **NCC Highways** - Amber. Access would need to demonstrate acceptable access visibility (2.4m x 59m) and adequate links to existing footways. **Highways Meeting** - Main issues are how they can access onto the Beccles Road; the access comes in at an angle – usually want it perpendicular to the road – however previous discussions relating to this site have suggested it is probably OK. Not acceptable to access from Sandy Lane.	
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?	Adjacent to the development boundary. 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.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	An adoptable estate road should be perpendicular to the existing highway for the first 15m, although for type 6 roads a minimum of 10.5m would be acceptable and the access would need to demonstrate acceptable access visibility (2.4m x 59m) and adequate links to existing footpaths	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural Grade 3	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)	Levels drop north to south and east to west.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Southern boundary fronts Sandy Lane, northern part residential and part open fields, eastern residential boundaries, western open fields and southwest residential property.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant tree/hedgerow boundary to the southern tip/southeast Residential boundaries to the east and part of the north. Residential to the southwest and natural vegetation to the northwest and west	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines,	None	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
telegraph poles)		
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Relatively contained, views glimpsed through the boundary with Sandy 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)	Adjacent to existing development boundary next to a smaller plot with planning permission for 5 dwellings. and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the west/southwest of the village. Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape and townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. A lower density would be required to enable the pond/surface water drainage at the southern end to be accommodated and to fit with the character and appearance of the area. Access could only be achieved through the adjoining consented site Highways has not raised an objection in terms of functioning of the local road network but adequate links to existing footways will need to be provided.	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	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:		

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.	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 considered suitable subject to mitigation of constraints, lower density and confirmation from NCC Highways that the site is acceptable in highway terms.

Site Visit Observations

Adjacent to existing development boundary next to a smaller plot with planning permission for 5 dwellings and well related to services. It would however represent a breakout to the west/southwest of the village.
Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape and townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. A lower density would be required to enable the pond/surface water drainage at the southern end to be accommodated and to fit with the character and appearance of the area.
Access could only be achieved through the adjoining consented site
Highways have not raised an objection in terms of functioning of the local road network but adequate links to existing footways will need to be provided.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately

Achievability

No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a reasonable site for development. The adjoining site has a partially implemented planning permission within the current settlement limit. This site is an extension to that using the same access. It is within the village with good access to services and the school. It will have a limited impact on the landscape which can be mitigated. Drainage requirements and retention of trees to the south will determine density. Adequate access will need to be achieved for an increased number of dwellings utilising the approved access from Beccles Road through the adjacent site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST REGULATION-18 CONSULTATION:

The site remains a REASONABLE option for development, but the boundaries of the allocation should be extended to include the area benefiting from extant planning permission to the east of the site (ref: 2016/2904). The site promoter has supplied additional evidence setting out the inter-relationship between the two sites and it is considered that in order to secure an optimal layout and improved relationship between the two areas a single allocation for up to 15 dwellings (including the 5 dwellings previously approved) is appropriate for this site.

Preferred Site: Yes

Date Completed: 26 January 2021

27. Tivetshall St Mary and Tivetshall St Margaret Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0319 / VC TIV1
Site address	Pear Tree Farm, west of The Street, Tivetshall St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.1 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(eee) Allocated site** **(fff) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25 dwellings = 23 dph (25 dph =27 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

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	Existing access from The Street. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through demolition of the old barn. NCC Highways: Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. *(Highways meeting: Would need to be considered with SN0318 as currently has no access point. Access to both would need to be via The Street and will require the demolition of the barn on The Street to create a suitable access/visibility. Whilst there are no footways there are large verges so walkers could step off the carriageway.)*	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	350m walk to primary school Post office and limited employment opportunities within 1800m Peak bus service within 1800m	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		500m walk to Village hall, recreation ground and village groups PH within 1800m	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 along eastern boundary and across site. No UKPN constraints. AW advises sewers crossing this site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site lies outside of the proposed fibre installation area.	Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Potentially contaminated by previous uses.	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Site is at low risk of flooding	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. **SNC Landscape Officer** - no landscape issues but concern about the townscape character.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. **SNC Landscape Officer** - no landscape issues but concern about the townscape character. **SNC Heritage Officer** – Amber. Site has bungalows on east and north which will be a factor and will lower density.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on designated and non-designated HAs but the impact could be reasonably mitigated. **HES** – Amber **SNC Heritage Officer** – Green. No impact on heritage assets to east.	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC confirmed access would need to be from The Street and widened through demolition of the old barn. Although there are no footways there are verges for walkers.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		NCC Highways: Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. *(Highways meeting: Would need to be considered with SN0318 as currently has no access point. Access to both would need to be via The Street and will require the demolition of the barn on The Street to create a suitable access/visibility. Whilst there are no footways there are large verges so walkers could step off the carriageway.)*	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential/vacant	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Well separated from HA to north and south on eastern side of The Street. Impacts of development of scale promoted should be fully assessed.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access onto The Street. NCC to confirm if improved access achievable. Likely to constrain scale of any development.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Vacant	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Part of larger parcel of vacant land to west, residential to north and east, agricultural to south – compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat, falling slightly to south west.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open to larger parcel of land to west. Hedgerow to south and residential boundaries to north and east.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees within southern boundary and scattered across southern section of site although these not high quality.	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 along eastern boundary and across site. Previous uses and dilapidated nature of site suggest potential for contamination – requires investigation.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site not prominent in views along The Street. Visually contained from wider views by boundary hedgerows.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Site close to primary school and limited local services. Lack of continuous footpath which is characteristic of settlement. Development would disrupt linear pattern but would allow infill without incursion into open countryside. Scale as promoted would result in suburban form of development not in character so density should be reduced. Site screened from wider views and so limits landscape impact. Otherwise, well connected to existing settlement. Impact on residential amenity could be limited by design and layout including single storey which would again restrict density. Access, potential contamination and utilities infrastructure likely to be main constraints to development. NCC to confirm traffic impacts on The Street and feasibility of safe access.	

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)	Approach by developers	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	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 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. Demolition of existing barn for access improvements required. Contamination investigation and possible remediation required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes but possible remediation costs due to previous uses may affect viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Suitable for allocation for low density development subject to satisfactory access being achieved, necessary site remediation and design/layout to protect existing residential amenity.

Site Visit Observations

The site is close to primary school and the limited local services. There is a lack of continuous footpath which is characteristic of this settlement. Development would disrupt linear pattern but would allow infill without incursion into open countryside. Scale as promoted would result in suburban form of development which is not in character so density should be reduced. Site screened from wider views and so limits landscape impact. Otherwise, well connected to existing settlement. Impact on residential amenity could be limited by design and layout including single storey which would again restrict density. Access, potential contamination and utilities infrastructure likely to be main constraints to development. NCC to confirm traffic impacts on The Street and feasibility of safe access.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Promoter has advised development achievable within 5 years.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered reasonable. The site is located close to the school and village hall and adjacent to the settlement limit and, although there are no footways, there are verges for walkers to step off the carriageway. Development on the site would read as part of the existing village and would be visually contained by field boundaries to the west and south with limited open views. Therefore, whilst development would disrupt the existing linear pattern the site would allow infill without significant incursion into open countryside. Potential contamination will need to be investigated but it is likely that this can be mitigated. Highways officers have confirmed that access would need to be widened from The Street through demolition of the old disused barn.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Through consideration of the comments made during the Regulation 18 consultation, the density of the site has been reviewed, particularly with regard to the need to protect the amenity of adjoining single storey properties. As such, the site is recommended for an allocation of approximately 20 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 03 December 2020

28. Toft Monks, Aldeby, Haddiscoe, Wheatacre and Burgh St Peter

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0414 / VC HAD1
Site address	Land north and south of Beccles Road, Haddiscoe
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Applications relating to caravan site use on site 1, historic refusals for one or two dwellings on site 2, no relevant history on site 3.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Site 1 (north of A143 / B1136 junction): 0.5 hectares; site 2 (north of Beccles Road and east of The Loke): 1.54 hectares, and site 3 (south of Beccles Road): 4.9 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(ggg) Allocated site** **(hhh) SL extension**	Allocations – site 1 for 5 units, site 2 for 39 units and site 3 for potentially 122 units
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Largely 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	Access is a significant constraint to sites east and west of The Loke **NCC Highways - Red** North Eastern Section: A143 frontage would require visibility splays at access in accordance with DMRB, unlikely to be achievable with the available 90m despite there being a 2m footway. The Loke measures at 3.4m on NMB, it wouldn't be feasible for 2 vehicles to pass which would be a particular concern regarding egress from A143, width seems fairly typical over the length of the road. Widening north of the A143 junction doesn't appear feasible. Safe pedestrian access could be formed at A143. North Western Section: too close to A143/B1336 junction to enable safe access. Southern Section: Stopping & turning movements at A143 with potential issues re visibility – would require most if not all trees to be removed from site frontage and provision of right turn facility. 1.2km walk along A143 to access school unlikely to be attractive to parents and may result in	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		additional car journeys to school, causing additional concerns re manoeuvring vehicles at the A143. N**CC Highways (meeting update Jan 2021** 3 parcels of land. All fronting the A143, which is a Corridor of Movement, with the associated restrictions. Vehicular access issue to both north and south which require a new junction; would new junctions be acceptable on CoM/what arrangements would be needed for right hand turns? The Loke, adjacent the NE site, is very restricted. There is a continuous footpath to the school, but this requires crossing the A143 close to the busy A143/B1136 junction. Land to south would be preferable as this would allow for a new footway on this side of the A143 and potentially a crossing point in a better location. Development could help reinforce the 30mph speed limit.	
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School 1.3km Bus service runs past site	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Site 3 is adjacent to village hall with sites 1 and 2 also in relatively close proximity Distance to The Haddiscoe Tavern public house 350 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewer capacity and local waster water treatment capacity are constraints	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but not sewerage 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 risk on highway	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland ALC: Grade 3	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development of parts of site could be detrimental to position of church as landmark within local landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Sites 1 and 2 are relatively well contained within settlement **SNC Landscape Officer –** concerns with impacts on the views of the Church on approach; consider that it conflicts with the landscape character assessment and what it is seeking to preserve – an indicative plan would need to demonstrate how an impact on the views could be mitigated; land rises to the south so would appear prominent; sites to sites to the north have tree issues.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Proximity to SSSI	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Potential impact on Grade I listed St Marys Church and associated grade II listed monument and memorial **NCC HES – Amber** **SNC Heritage officer**- – on plan the site does not look well related to the setting of the church – however, in reality when driving along the A143 west, the field is very open in views and the church is a very prominent landmark feature when seen in this rural setting. This is also quite an old route to Yarmouth with the crossing at Haddiscoe – so quite an historic view. The church wills still be viewed from closer to – but I would say any development here would have a degree of harm on the setting. Potential mitigation could be setting the buildings further back from road etc.	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	Parts of local road network are heavily constrained, particularly The Loke	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Village hall to east, residential and agricultural	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Sites 1 and 2 are more contained visually, with site 2 relating better to the existing settlement. Site 3 would not relate well to existing pattern of development and would adversely affect landscape character and also has more potential to adversely affect the setting of the church	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access unlikely to be acceptable off A143, whilst The Loke is highly constrained. Further clarification from the Highway Authority required	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Either agricultural, garden or use as a caravan site. No compatibility issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Village hall could result in some compatibility issues with site 3, but given distance from boundary and relation with other residential properties is unlikely to prevent residential development.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site 1 is flat, site 2 levels fall to the north, site 3 levels fall towards the southern boundary	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site 1 is enclosed by mature trees and hedgerows. Site 2 has trees along southern, eastern and northern boundaries. Boundaries of site 3 are more open but still with sections of hedgerows and trees.	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 of site. Some trees within site 1.	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 contamination or infrastructure	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 3 from A143, views of sites 1 and 2 more constrained by 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)	Site 3 would not relate to existing pattern of development and would potentially impact on setting of church. Site 1 is also more detached from the existing pattern of development, but site 2 could be acceptable in form and character terms if an acceptable access can be found	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	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 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?	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 other than visual improvement of site	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Sites can be modified to be an acceptable size for an allocation.

Site Visit Observations

Sites 1 and 2 are more contained visually, with site 2 relating better to the existing settlement. Site 3 would not relate well to existing pattern of development and would adversely affect landscape character and also has more potential to adversely affect the setting of the church

Local Plan Designations

Sites are outside the development boundary, although either adjacent to or in close proximity.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is much larger than the scale of development currently being sought, however a smaller parcel could be a reasonable allocation for development, subject to achieving a suitable access and mitigation for landscape and heritage harm. All three sites front the A143, a Corridor of Movement. Whilst the north eastern site has The Lock running to the west this is a narrow and constrained access which is not considered to be an acceptable access point. An existing footpath runs to the northern side of the A143 whilst development of the southern parcel could allow for a new footway on this side of the road and a better located crossing point for the school. Development could have an impact on the setting of the Grade I listed Church and it is noted that on approach from the west the Church is a prominent feature in this rural landscape setting. Given the site size however, potential mitigation measures could be incorporated into the layout and design of the site include setting the buildings further back within the site. An indicative plan would need to demonstrate how the impact of development on these views could be appropriately mitigated.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Through the Regulation 18 consultation the Highway Authority confirmed that, as a Corridor of Movement, the site would require a right turn lane on the A143, to maintain the safe and free flow of traffic. In addition, data has indicated that noise pollution may be a concern if development is proposed too close to the A143. Combined with the need to protect the setting of the Grade I listed church, and retain the open aspect of this site, it is now proposed to push the developed part of the site further south within this overall landholding. To mitigate the cost of highways works and the provision of a substantial open/landscaped area on the northern part of the site, it is recommended that a modestly increased development of up to 35 dwellings in allocated.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 7 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4017 / VC BUR1
Site address	Land north of Staithe Road, Burgh St Peter
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.64 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(iii) Allocated site** **(jjj) 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 due to nature of road **NCC Highways – Green** No feasible safe walking route to school.	Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ 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 stops close by- limited service Local employment (Aldeby Business Park) within 650m of the site	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Burgh St Peter village hall 150 metres Distance to White Lion public house 400 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	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 in south-west corner	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained within landscape. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Site is relatively well contained within pattern of settlement	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage sites in close proximity **NCC HES – Green** SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and biodiversity net gain. Close to a registed common- Dick's Mount and The Parish Pit	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained as narrow lanes with no footways **NCC Highways – Red** No feasible safe walking route to school.	Red
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?	Site is relatively well contained within existing pattern of settlement, but estate development would still be out of character with the surrounding development	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable but likely to result in loss of hedgerow. Pedestrian access is poor	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)	Residential properties on southern side of Staithe Road and also to east and west of site. Agricultural land to north. No compatibility issues	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)	Hedge along southern boundary with Staithe Road, with some hedging and trees on other boundaries	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 site 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)	Overheard power cable running east to west across site	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Some views across site from Staithe Road.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Not likely to be suitable due to distance from services, particularly schools, and the narrow rural road network	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
		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:		

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. Highway and landscape constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site is located far from many services, including the nearest primary school, along rural lanes with no footway. Relatively well contained within the existing pattern of development in the settlement, albeit not in a location that estate development would be in character.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a reasonable option for development. Access can be achieved via Staithe Road, however there is existing hedgerow that may need to be removed in order to achieve visibility, this would need to be assessed in accordance with hedgerow regulations. Highways concerns have been raised about the lack of footways and safe walking route to the local primary school. The site is relatively well contained within the existing pattern of development and, although development of the site would represent a breakout into the countryside to the north of Staithe Road, it is considered that townscape and landscape impacts could be mitigated. It is noted that overhead power cables run east to west across the site and there is an area of surface water flood risk adjacent to the south west corner of the site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

A small area of the site, to the rear of Little Lodge, is removed from the proposed allocation, as this would have no frontage to Staithe Road and would remain part of the wider field. Otherwise, the site is recommended for allocation for at least 12 dwellings, broadly consistent with the Regulation 18 consutlation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 5 January 2021

29. Wicklewood Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0577REVA / VC WIC1 (site also promoted as part of a wider site – SN0577REVB)
Site address	Land to the south of Wicklewood Primary School
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including **(kkk) Allocated site** **(lll) SL extension**	Allocation of 12-25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 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

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	Access off Hackford Road would be constrained due to proximity to junctions. The Green is a constrained country lane **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Access would be required to the site via The Green only, widen carriageway to 5.5m to Hackford Road. Provide footway over whole site frontage including suitable pedestrian crossing to north side of road and footway to the school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Adjacent to Wicklewood Primary School Distance to bus service 230 metres Local employment 1km	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 550 metres Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 230 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water supply and sewerage infrastructure, including the water recycling centre, may need to be upgraded	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available AW advise sewers crossing the 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 surface water flood risk on highway and to south of site but should not prohibit development **LLFA** – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		E3 Hingham – Mattishall Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Potential intrusion into open elevated landscape. **SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER** - This is a very exposed site; with careful design it could be a positive addition to the landscape providing a gateway to the village however a poorly designed site would be detrimental to the landscape setting. If this site is allocated it would benefit from specific policy text or a design brief – possibly to consider a lower number of units on the site or the submission of a sketch scheme. The landscape character refers to views towards the Church however whilst these would need to be checked they would not appear to be significant. Wicklewood has a history of substantial hedgerow loss and this could be an opportunity to reinstate lost hedgerow patterns. Tree planting would also be required on the site.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Main area of existing development is to north of Hackford Road	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to priority habitat (buffer suggested). Potential for protected species/habitat, and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed building to south HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	The Green is a constrained narrow lane **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Access site via The Green, widen carriageway to 5.5m to Hackford Road. Provide footway over whole site frontage including suitable pedestrian crossing to north side of road and footway to the school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Adjacent to school	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would be slightly detached from main part of village which is to the north of Hackford Road, but would be adjacent to the school which is also to the south of Hackford Road. There is some further residential development to the south of Hackford Road along Milestone Lane to the west	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways advise that access should be from The Green.	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)	Adjacent to school, with residential on opposite side of Hackford Road to north. Otherwise agricultural. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Largely level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries with highway are open. Boundaries for REVA option would involve creating new boundaries within larger field	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Little habitat. Some hedging on boundary with school.	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 existing infrastructure / contamination	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is open with views across site from The Green and Hackford Road. Potential views from Milestone Lane.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Although development would result in some intrusion into landscape, the site is well related to the school.	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	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)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	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)	NCC Highways require footway across whole site frontage and to the school and suitable pedestrian crossing	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	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

This site forms a smaller parcel within a larger site that is also being promoted (SN0577REVB). This site is of a suitable size for allocation and whilst the site promoter has provided a suggested location for this site, it has also been confirmed that there would be flexibility in terms of its location with the overall landholding. The site has been assessed on the basis of the information submitted at this time. The site is within a prominent location within the landscape but is well connected to the local services, including the local primary school. There are no heritage concerns and it is considered that the issues raised by highways could be successfully addressed.

Site Visit Observations

Site with open boundaries in large open landscape. Adjacent to school. Some precedent for development to south of Hackford Road, but would have some level of intrusion into open countryside.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

This site is considered to be a reasonable option for allocation. The site is in a prominent location within the local landscape however with careful design it could enhance the gateway to the village. A Design Brief may be required for this site to ensure appropriate design. The site is well connected to the settlement and highways matters could be reasonably addressed through the development of the site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Due to the open aspect of this site and the need to create both a 'village green' to the front (northeast) and a more sensitive boundary with the wider countryside (to the south and west), a revised site layout has been prepared by the site promoter, on a larger footprint. Otherwise, the site remains recommended for allocation for up to 30 dwellings, consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 12 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4045SL / VC WIC2
Site address	Land south of Hackford Road, Wicklewood
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.49 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(mmm) Allocated site** **(nnn) SL extension**	Settlement limit extension (An indicative scheme suggests six dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12 dwellings at 25dph 12dph at 6 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	Access would be from Hackford Road on inside of bend **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Subject to satisfactory access and provision of 2.0m wide continuous footway at south side of Hackford Rd and to school. **NCC Highways meeting –** Ok subject to footway to the school. Would need a safe crossing point to access the facilities and services on the opposite side of the road NCC TO CHECK LEVEL OF CROSSING REQUIRED (e.g., dropped kerb/ zebra crossing); due to the road configuration it is unlikely that speeding is a particular issue along this stretch of road (as noted in the consultation responses) however there may be a perception of speed when walking alongside the road.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Adjacent to Wicklewood Primary School Distance to bus service 500 metres Local employment 800 metres away	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 800 metres Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 500 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Confirmation needed that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	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	Green	No identified flood risk **LLFA** – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		E3 Hingham – Mattishall Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is contained within existing development in the settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land. **SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER** - There is a 'good' hedgerow along the site frontage which would need to be assessed against Policy DM4.8. Views of the Church across this site would also need to be considered	Amber
Townscape	Green	Site is contained within the existing pattern of development.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity **NCC ECOLOGY** – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade I listed church and Grade II listed war memorial to north-west of site **SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER** – Amber. Grade I listed church to north and war memorial. This would be within wider setting. However there is some existing landscaping affecting intervisibility. The main views of the church tower appear to be to the west across the landscape to the west. There are some views of the tower approaching from the south along Hackford Road and these would need to be taken into account in setting out layout etc. **HES** – Amber	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Hackford Road has reasonable capacity and footway **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Subject to satisfactory access and provision of 2.0m wide continuous footway at south side of Hackford Rd and to school. ***(HIGHWAYS MEETING*** - OK, subject to a footway to the school)	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	School and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Potential impact on church, however this should be relatively limited by existing residential development on the northern side of Hackford Road – Senior Heritage and Design Officer to comment. Otherwise relatively well contained within existing form and character of settlement.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable onto Hackford Road but NCC Highways comments will be needed	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural 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 west and on opposite side of Hackford Road to north. School playing field to south. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Some trees to northern boundary, hedge along highway boundary. Wire fence with school playing field	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some potential habitat in trees and hedging	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)	Overhead power line runs east-west across site	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from Hackford Road	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Site is relatively contained and could be developed in keeping with form and character of settlement and therefore is considered acceptable for a settlement limit extension.	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	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)	Unknown	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?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is suitable for a settlement limit extension. The site relates well to the existing settlement and a small development would be compatible with the existing form of development. The site is within proximity of the Listed Church however it is contained within wider views and with careful design would not have a significant impact on the setting of the Church. Access to the site should be achievable however this may result in the loss of part/ all of the frontage hedgerow.

Site Visit Observations

Site is well contained within the existing settlement. Access would be on inside of bend so access arrangements would need view of highways. Potential for some additional land to north to be included which could allow for allocation but potential heritage issues with church.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a reasonable extension to the existing settlement limit. The site relates well to the existing form of development and could accommodate a small allocation. Highways access to the site is likely to be acceptable although it may result in the loss of the frontage hedgerow. The site is within the setting of a listed building but due to the existing pattern of development is relatively well contained and with appropriate mitigation measures would not have a significant impact on the setting of the Church. Mitigation could include design measures to the north of the site to retain views of the Church from Hackford Road.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

The site promoted at the Regulation 18 stage was irregular in shape, and only 0.49ha in size, making it more difficult to achieve suitable density and layout to accommodate development within the constraints of the site. The site promoter has subsequently extended the site to address this issue. The site remains recommended for an allocation of at least 12 dwellings, broadly consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 12 November 2020

30. Winfarthing and Shelfanger Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4050 / VC WIN1
Site address	Land to the west of Hall Road, Winfarthing
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Greenfield/ unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.7ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(ooo) Allocated site** **(ppp) SL extension**	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	8dph (Up to 30 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

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	Access to the site would be via Hall Road – possible ransom strip along Chapel Close. Local footpath network to be checked on site visit. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Green. Subject to acceptable visibility & c/w widening to 5.5m minimum at site frontage. Footway improvement required to 2.0m from village hall to school. NCC Highways meeting - TRO would be required along the site frontage and would need to be included in the policy text.	Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment	Green	Winfarthing services: Primary school – c. 750m Local employment	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport			
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall. – c. 240m Public House – c. 525m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utilities capacity to be confirmed with utility providers	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known infrastructure constraints on the site – site is adjacent to existing development at Chapel Close AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within an area identified as being with the ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	The western section of the site is shown to be an area at risk of flooding and therefore this would preclude development in this part of the site **LLFA** - Amber. Mitigation is required for heavy constraints on the site with significant information required. The site is affected by and adjacent to significant flooding (flowpath). A large percentage of the site is unaffected by surface water flooding. The east of the site is not affected by flooding.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B4: Waveney Tributary Farmland – large scale open landscape on higher ground with views; linear settlement developments ALC- Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	The site is prominent within the open landscape and is in an area with small scale development at the edge of the settlement. Development of the whole site could therefore have an adverse impact on the landscape. **SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER** – Development here could enhance the gateway into the settlement however care would need to be taken regarding the scale of the site allocated for development.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The site is located adjacent to existing residential development however this is of a smaller scale. Development of the site at the proposed scale would impact on the transition between rural surroundings and settlement. A smaller scheme to the north of the proposed site, adjacent to the road, would perhaps be more acceptable **SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER** – Amber. In design terms only the front part of the site should be developed as it is unbalancing the historic grain of the village – being a very linear village and this being a site very much on the northern edge of the settlement.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No known issues **LLFA** – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	No impact on the historic environment **SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER** – Green. No heritage impact. **HES** – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No impact on open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Highways to advise about the local road network capacity **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Subject to acceptable visibility & c/w widening to 5.5m minimum at site frontage. Footway improvement required to 2.0m from village hall to school.	Amber
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?	No impact on the historic environment. Development of the whole site would adversely impact on the townscape as it would erode the transition between rural and settlement. A road frontage linear development of a smaller scale would be more in keeping with the existing grain of development in the village. Chapel Close is a mix of well-spaced 1x and 2x storey dwellings that are set back from the highway. Crescent/ horseshoe pattern of development.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Good visibility along Hall Road – new access would be required. Possible access onto Chapel Road? No existing footpath along the road frontage although there would be an option to create this.	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 and residential – design of development would need to ensure no adverse impact on the residential amenities existing Chapel Close properties but through good design this would be possible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Low hedgerow along the road frontage but otherwise an open agricultural field with minimal boundaries and/or features.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No obvious issues identified	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 obvious issues identified	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 open and clearly visibly with the landscape. The site is marks a transition between the village and the countryside however the village hall and some sporadic development is to the north of the 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 open and clearly visibly with the landscape. Development of the scale proposed would have a detrimental impact but a reduced number in a linear formation would be acceptable in townscape terms. Sporadic development to the north of the site also reduces the visual impact of development on this site. No significant highways or ecological issues identified.	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)**
Surface Water Flooding (ALL)	Western section of the site affected	N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Development would not be suitable in the affected area of the site	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)	Unknown	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	5-10 years	Amber
Comments:		Amber

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No additional information has been submitted	Amber
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?	Yes	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 suitable for development, excluding the identified areas of flooding in the western areas of the site. The proposed scale of the site is too large however - although the flood risk would preclude development on part of it – and a reduced suite boundary (along the road frontage) would be the most appropriate solution. There are no identified highway, landscape or townscape constraints identified for this site and development of the site could provide an opportunity to enhance the entrance to Winfarthing.

Site Visit Observations

At a reduced scale, and following the road frontage, the site would be an acceptable option in terms of townscape impact. A linear form of development would likely be the most appropriate design solution in this location, taking care to avoid adversely impacting on the residential amenities of the existing residents at Chapel Close. No significant access issues have been identified.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations (flood risk noted).

Availability

The site is confirmed as being available within the LP period.

Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be reasonable subject to a smaller site boundary that excludes the areas of flooding and reduces the number of dwellings to c. 15. A linear form of development along the road frontage would be the preferred development form. Through good design development of this site could enhance the entrance to the settlement, and would not result in harmful landscape or townscape impacts. Access to the site would be achievable.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGULATION 18:

Following consultation, the site remains a REASONABLE option for development. A review of the site and surrounding development has concluded that it could accommodate an increased number of dwellings (approximately 20) on a slightly larger allocation, whilst remaining in character with the existing development to the south of the site at Chapel Close and forming a gateway into the settlement.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 13 October 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4055 / VC WIN2
Site address	Land off The Street, Winfarthing
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **Allocated site** **SL extension**	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	24dph – (c. 24 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	Site has road frontage and appears to front a section of road with good visibility. Footpath provision to be checked on site NCC HIGHWAYS – Green. Subject to provision of frontage footway, formal crossing facility and part time 20mph speed limit at school. NCC Highways meeting - No issues with access for linear development along an extended site frontage (Mill Road); extending development along the road frontage so that it is mirrored on both sides would accord with policy for 30mph areas and encourage slower speeds.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Winfarthing services: Primary school – c. 80m Local employment	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Public house – c. 340m Village Hall – c. 1km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utilities capacity to be confirmed with providers – the site is adjacent to existing development but promoter notes no gas or mains sewerage available	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known infrastructure constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known contamination or ground stability issues on the site	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	There is an area of surface water flooding in the north east corner of the site, adjacent to the neighbouring dwelling – this would impact on the design of the site.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		LLFA – Green. Mitigation required for heavy constraints. Standard information required. The site is partially affected by and adjacent to significant flowpath flooding. A large percentage of the site is unaffected by surface water flooding.	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B4: Waveney Tributary Farmland – large scale open landscape on higher ground with views; linear settlement developments ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site sits comfortably within the wider landscape SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER – Development of this site would provide an opportunity to enhance the gateway to the settlement.	Green
Townscape	Amber	The site is at the edge of the built form of the settlement although there is a linear row of dwellings on the opposite side of the road. The site would not accord with the linear grain of development in Winfarthing, however this would not have a significantly harmful impact on the overall townscape, particularly with careful landscape mitigation measures being agreed SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Amber. This should be limited to frontage linear development only to retain character of the village and fit in with existing local character along the street.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No known issues – potential issues could be overcome LLFA – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No impact SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green. HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Highways to advise re. the capacity of the local road network NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to provision of frontage footway, formal crossing facility and part time 20mph speed limit at school.	Amber
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?	No impact on the historic environment. Development of the scale proposed would not be linear and would therefore be at odds with the existing townscape however with appropriate design and landscaping to the southern boundary of the site this would not have a detrimental impact on the overall townscape	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access to the site from Mill Road – footpath on opposite site of the road connecting to the rest of the village to the north	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 – dwellings adjacent to the site are single storey in large plots	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Minimal	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Tree belt along western boundary of the field (beyond the area promoted) – this provides some screening of the site on the approach along Mill Road– the site is adjacent to existing development	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No issues identified	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	The site is open within the landscape and there are clear views into and across the site. A tree belt to the west provides some screening in longer views from the south.	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)	Development of this site would not follow the existing linear form of development however the site is compact and would have a lesser impact on the surrounding landscape than other sites that have been promoted, and the impact of development on this site could be mitigated by both design and landscaping.	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	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	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)	The promoter has confirmed deliverability but no supporting evidence has been 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)	Yes – some off-site highways works would be required, including a crossing	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes – although no supporting evidence submitted at this stage	Amber
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 suitable for development. It is well connected and relates well to the main settlement. No significant highways issues have been identified at this stage. An area of surface water flooding to the north of the site has been identified which would impact on the layout/ design of development on this site.

Site Visit Observations

The site is prominent within the wider landscape however an existing treebelt to the south provides some screening when approaching from that direction, reducing the impact of development in this location. Fewer numbers would be achievable if a linear approach is considered to be more appropriate. Development of the site would provide an opportunity to enhance the entrance to the village.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

The site is considered to be available within the LP period.

Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a reasonable option for development. It benefits from good connectivity and relates well to the existing built form of the settlement. Through good design development of this site could provide an opportunity to create an attractive entrance to the village. Off-site highway works have been identified however these are considered to be achievable.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGULATION 18:

Further to the Regulation 18 consultation a review of this site has taken place and the site remains a REASONABLE option for development. However, in order to better reflect the existing form of development it is considered that a liner pattern of development would be appropriate on this site, extending the site further to the south than previously shown. This design approach would also enable development to avoid constraints identified on the site and has the support of NCC Highways as it is considered that it would improve the current highway safety along The Street adjacent to the site. This would represent a slight reduction in the allocation numbers, being up to 20 dwellings (rather than 25).

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 13 October 2020

31. Woodton and Bedingham Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0278 / VC WOO1
Site address	Land south of Church Road, Woodton, NR35 2NB
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated/ greenfield/ agricultural
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.1ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(a) Allocated site** **(b) SL extension**	Allocation (Promoted for up to 50 dwellings, village shop, land for replacement village hall, POS and community garden)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	16 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

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	The site has a road frontage and access appears to be achievable by all means. Previously scored AMBER in the HELAA prepared by the GNLP. NCC Highways to advise whether access is achievable. **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. Provide 2m wide footway across the site frontage towards B1332. Widen footway from site to village school. ***(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)***	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	The site lies within close proximity to the local primary school and playing fields, as well as the village amenities. Primary school – adjacent to the site Playing fields – adjacent to the site Bus service – approximately 450m PH & Village stores – approximately 450m	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		(see above)	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed for the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known utilities infrastructure connection issues AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known ground stability or contamination issues on the site **NCC M&W** – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site proceeds as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	
Flood Risk	Green	The GNLP HELAA scored the flood risk as AMBER. Additional supporting information has been submitted indicating that the site Is not in an area at risk of flooding **LLFA** – Green. Few or no constraints. Small areas of surface water risk identified in the 1:1000 year rainfall event as shown on the Environment Agency's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. Watercourse apparent 40m from the south eastern boundary of the site (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). Not served by AW connection.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B1 – Tas Tributary Farmland – open landscapes with sporadic settlements and pockets of woodland ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	A significant parcel of land in an open landscape – development of this site could have an adverse impact on the local landscape without appropriate mitigation measures. Design officer to provide comment. **SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER** - General concerns about site connectivity . The setting of the new recreation facility was carefully negotiated, so would need to take this into account if allocating this site.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	The promoted site is of a significant scale and is slightly removed from the main settlement which is further to the south of the site. Development could be located to the south of the site to 'cluster' it with the existing built form however this would result in an unfortunate access road/driveway; development to the north of the site would appear incongruous as a standalone site however if allocated alongside SN0262 and SN0268SL this would create a new focus for the village. **SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER** – Amber. Would agree development to the south of the site. There are Taylor & Green bungalows to the south but that does not necessarily preclude development. Awkward access from the north if developing to the south.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	The site previously scored an AMBER in the GNLP HELAA exercise. An ecological survey has subsequently been submitted confirming that the site would not have a significant impact although it would affect a 'Hedgerow Habitat of Principal Importance' along the eastern boundary. For this reason to RAG score remains. **NCC ECOLOGY** – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	There are LBs to the north and north-east of the site although there is some separation and impacts are not considered to be significant. Heritage officer to comment. **SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER** – Green **HES** – Amber	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No loss of POS	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Previously scored AMBER due to NCC Highways concerns about the local highway network. NCC Highways to provide comment. **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. Provide 2m wide footway across the site frontage towards B1332. Widen footway from site to village school. ***(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)***	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/ residential/ recreational	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site is some distance from the heritage assets to the north and therefore would not have a significant impact on these. Development to the centre/ north of the promoted parcel of land would have the greatest impact on the townscape due to its relative separation from the existing developments. Development alongside SN0262 and SN0268SL would be improve the acceptability of this, creating a cluster of dwellings that relate to each other. Development to the south would have a reduced landscape impact as it would be clustered adjacent to existing dwellings (principally single storey in form) however access would need to be obtained from Church Road to the north which would create an unfortunate access road through the site.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could only be obtained via Church Road to the north where the site has a road frontage. There is an existing footpath on the opposite side of Church Road.	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/ agricultural/ recreation ground	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The topography of the site is undulating – the land gently falls away to the existing development at the southern boundary. These dwellings therefore have a lesser impact in the wider landscape setting.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows and open boundaries	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No obvious additional features (subject to comments above)	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)	BT poles along the site frontage and power lines along the western boundary	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 prominent within the wider landscape and has minimal built form surrounding it at present. The southern sections of the site are less visible due to the topography of the land. Existing residential development to the south is not particularly visible in the wider landscape due to its form and character and the changes in levels. This site currently marks the transition from the rural environ into the edges of the village.	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 larger than is being sought as part of this process and at the scale promoted would be detrimental to the wider landscape setting. A reduced number of dwellings would need to be agreed on the site. Development to the south of the site would be most appropriate with the current form of development in Woodton, however if sites to the north of Church Road are allocated development to the north of this site would be preferable.	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	No conflicting constraints 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 – 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:		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)	Additional plans and technical details have been submitted to support the promotion of the site, including a letter of support from SAFFRON housing	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highways improvements may be required for access in particular – NCC to advise	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes. In addition, a letter of support has been provided from SAFFRON (although this would need to be checked if the numbers were reduced on the site)	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Yes – the promoter of the site refers to a village shop, community garden (for school usage) and POS (however this scale of development is not considered to be acceptable).	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is too large for development in its promoted scale as it would be an inappropriate addition to the settlement. Development clustered to the north of the site, alongside allocations SN0262 and SN0268SL, would be the preferred form and location of development on this site. Landscape considerations have been noted, including the impact on the landscaping of adjacent recreation ground which would be impacted by development on this site.

Site Visit Observations

The site is prominent in the landscape and marks the transition from the countryside to the edge of the village. Development within the northern section of the site would have a greater impact on the wider landscape setting and would be less sympathetic to the existing character of the immediate area if it was allocated as a standalone site; development alongside other sites promoted for allocation and to the north of Church Road would therefore be preferable as this would result in a more coherent grouping of dwellings. Development to the south of the site would be less intrusive and more in keeping with the existing wider setting but would raise issues regarding access arrangements.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations .

Availability

The site is considered to be available within a timely manner .

Achievability

Subject to the constraints noted above the site is considered to be achievable. It is also noted that the site has been promoted with a number of additional benefits. The affordable housing is supported by SAFFRON Housing. However, this would be based upon the delivery of a significantly larger site which is not currently being supported.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

A smaller allocation than the currently promoted site is considered to be a reasonable for development. This assessment is based upon a smaller site area and number of dwellings than the site is promoted for. Also that it is demonstrated that it can be developed to address highway concerns whilst minimising landscape impacts.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGULATION 18:

Additional evidence was submitted by the promoter of the site illustrating the full potential of a larger site area with increased dwelling numbers, including the additional site benefits that would arise from the delivery of the full site. This includes improved pedestrian connectivity between the primary school and the wider village (via Woodyard Place), which is considered to be a significant benefit to the community and could be achieved through the delivery of a revised, and larger, site area and an increase in site numbers. Issues have also been raised locally regarding the long-term provision of pre-school places, which this site could also help address through land to accommodate a site (or compensatory land if the pre-school were to use part of the existing recreation ground). As such an allocation of up to 50 dwellings is recommended to provide a more comprehensive development of the site and deliver the benefits identified above.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 6 August 2020

32. Wreningham, Ashwellthorpe and Fundenhall

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0242 / VC ASH1 (part)
Site address	Land to west of New Road, Ashwellthorpe
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusal for residential
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.67 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(c) Allocated site** **(d) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	4 -10 dwellings = up to 15 dph (25 dph = 17 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

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	Field access from New Road. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development. **NCC Highways** – Amber. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No safe walking route to Wreningham Primary School. Carriageway widening and footways would be required.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Red	More than 3000m walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 3000m and bus service (including peak) within 1800m	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall (with groups), recreation ground and public house within 1800m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, foul drainage and electricity available to site	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. **SNC Environmental Protection** – Green. Land Quality: - No potentially contaminated sites shown within 500m of the site in question on the Landmark database or PCLR database. - Historic OS maps show a void (about 7m by 11m) was once present about 250m to the south which has been filled with unknown material. This is considered to represent a low risk to the site in question. - 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. Amenity:	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		- No issues observed.	
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Settled Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		D1: Wymondham settled plateau farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. **SDC Landscape Officer** - If combined with SN0017SL and accessed via a private road behind the roadside hedgerow this site could be acceptable in landscape terms	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not have any direct impacts on HAs **HES** – Amber.	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated. **NCC Highways** – Red.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No safe walking route to Wreningham Primary School. Carriageway widening and footways would be required.	
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?	Existing field access. NCC to confirm if access achievable.	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 - compatible	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 most boundaries including highway.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees within boundary hedgerows Pond outside western 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 boundary. 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 in views from New Road. Otherwise visually contained by boundary landscaping.	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)	Isolated from school with no continuous footpath provision and access to limited local services only. Does not abut settlement limit though these impacts could be mitigated by design and landscaping.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	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	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Carriageway widening and footways would be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	N/A	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not suitable for allocation due to isolation from school and lack of connectivity to most services.

Site Visit Observations

Isolated from school with no continuous footpath provision and access to limited local services only. Does not abut settlement limit though these impacts could be mitigated by design and landscaping.

Local Plan Designations

Open Countryside.

Availability

Statement from promoter.

Achievability

Statement from promoter.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site should be considered with adjacent site SN0017 which is next to the settlement limit. The site is remote from the school but relatively close to the village hall, recreation ground and public house. It is well contained within the existing field boundaries and would not have a significant impact on the wider landscape. It would reflect the existing character of development and would read as an extension to the village. It would require removal of some frontage hedge as carriageway widening and footways would be required but would be limited.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

The site has been modestly increased in size to reflect the field boundaries. The site remains suitable for allocation in conjunction with SN0017, for up to 15 dwellings, which is broadly consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 12 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0017SL / VC ASH1 (part)
Site address	New Road, Ashwellthorpe
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.22 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **Allocated site** **SL extension**	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified (25 dph = 5.5 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	Field access from New Road. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development. NCC Highways – Red. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No safe walking route to Wreningham Primary School.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Red	More than 3000m walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 3000m and bus service (including peak) within 1800m	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall (with groups), recreation ground and public house within 1800m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has not provided any confirmation	Amber
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. **SNC Environmental Protection** – Green. Land Quality: - No potentially contaminated sites shown within 500m of the site in question on the Landmark database or PCLR database. - Historic OS maps show a void (about 7m by 11m) was once present about 250m to the south which has been filled with unknown material. This is considered to represent a low risk to the site in question. - 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. Amenity: - No issues observed.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Identified SW flood risk along northern boundary.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Settled Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		D1: Wymondham settled plateau farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. **SDC Landscape Officer** - If combined with SN0242 and accessed via a private road behind the roadside hedgerow this site could be acceptable in landscape terms	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not have any direct impacts on HAs **HES** – Amber.	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated. NCC Highways – Red. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		transport modes. No safe walking route to Wreningham Primary School.	
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?	Existing field access. NCC to confirm if access achievable while retaining tree on boundary.	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/trees to north. Remaining boundaries open to farmland and highway	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow to northern boundary. Pond outside western 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 boundary. 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 in views from New Road and from open land to west and south.	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)	Isolated from school with no continuous footpath provision and access to limited local services only. Acceptable impacts on landscape and townscape subject to design, landscaped screening of boundaries and access.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	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?		
Comments:	Not confirmed	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)	Not confirmed	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Access and carriageway improvements required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Not confirmed	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not suitable for SL extension due to isolation from school and lack of connectivity to most services. Better for other impacts to be assessed against local plan policies as part of application.

Site Visit Observations

Isolated from school and access to limited local services only. Acceptable impacts on landscape and townscape subject to design, landscaped screening of boundaries and access

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

Not confirmed.

Achievability

Not confirmed.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is immediately adjacent to the Settlement Limit and should be considered with adjacent site SN0242. The site is remote from the school but relatively close to the village hall, recreation ground and public house. It is well contained within the existing field boundaries and would not have a significant impact on the wider landscape. It would reflect the existing character of development and would read as an extension to the village. It may require removal of some frontage hedge as carriageway widening and footways would be required but less if access is gained through SN0242. [*Original conclusion reworded post-Regulation 18 to aid clarity*]

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

The site remains suitable for allocation in conjunction with SN0242, for up to 15 dwellings, which is broadly consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 12 January 2021

SETTLEMENT LIMIT EXTENSIONS

1. Alpington, Yelverton and Bergh Apton Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0529SL
Site address	Land east of Nichols Road, Alpington
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	Site was rejected by the Inspector at the last Local Plan Examination (Main Modification 45) as it '*does not logically form an infill plot within the settlement*'.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.37ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(e) Allocated site** **(f) SL extension**	SL, for approx. 6 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	16 dwellings/ha as promoted.
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Nichols Road narrows noticeably once past the School, and the access to the recent development on the corner of Nichols Road/Bergh Apton Road is taken from the latter and runs to the rear of the properties fronting Nichols Road. It appears that the off-carriageway footway could be extended to serve this site. NCC Highways – Amber, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. NCC Highways Meeting - Nichols Road is narrow and would ideally need to be widened. Affordable housing development adjacent has provided a new footpath, which could be extended. NCC would prefer frontage accesses, rather than rear driveways like the adjoining scheme.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Primary School - less than 50m Green Pastures Farm Shop - 1,675m A146 Hellington Corner bus stop (routes inc. X2, X21, X22) - 1,750m Various small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity.	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall with Recreation Ground - 400m Yelverton Football Club - 550m Pub - 400m	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 NR14 7QD 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. - Nothing of concern with regard to land quality noted on the historic OS maps.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		- 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. NCC Minerals & Waste - sites under 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations 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	None identified.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	No designated landscapes. Site is the corner of an agricultural field, with low bank/verge to the road frontage, but no boundaries to the two sides open to the field. Site is similar in scale the recent adjoining development on the corner with Bergh Apton Road, which has significant landscaping to the rear (east).	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Grade 2 Agricultural Land SNC Landscape Meeting – Acceptable in context of development already built on this corner. Opportunity to enhance the entrance to the village from the south. No DM4.8 issues	
Townscape	Green	Adjoins recently completed exceptions sites, and also faces properties on the opposite side of Nichols Road. SNC Heritage & Design - should have front vehicle access.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designated sites within close proximity.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets close to the site. SNC Heritage & Design - Green HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Nichols Road is narrow at this point (single carriageway), although there appears to be the potential to extend the off-carriageway footway to serve the site. Otherwise links to the current network serving the village, which links to the A146 and Poringland. NCC Highways – Red, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. NCC Highways Meeting – Previous comments re accessibility to services	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		an error. Nichols Road is narrow and would ideally need to be widened. Affordable housing development adjacent has provided a new footpath, which could be extended. NCC would prefer frontage accesses, rather than rear driveways like the adjoining scheme.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential (mixed densities) and agricultural. Public footpath crosses the field to the south. SNC Env Services, Amenity: - No issues observed.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Although the site extends the settlement into the countryside, the adjacent exceptions housing scheme and properties opposite	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Narrowness of the carridgeway would appear to be the main constraint.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield, 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)	Residential to the north and west, agricultural to the remaining boundaries. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site with slight bank to the road frontage.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	No defined boundaries to the south and east (open agricultural field). C21st housing to the north. Mixed housing on the opposite side of the road to the	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	None directly effecting the site.	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/wires on the road frontage (which also run in front of the existing housing on the east side of the road).	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Mostly seen with a backdrop of existing housing. Open on two sides,	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Small site with no defined boundary on two sides. Nichols Road is narrow (single carriageway). However, small Development Boundary extension could be possible.	

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	Attached to the existing Development Boundary at the western end of the site.	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 evidence of marketing.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green
Comments:	Promoted by and agent with indicative layout. Footpath has been diverted to the south to avoid the site.	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)	Indicative layout, diversion of existing footpath to the south, single ownership.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Footway/highway improvement. Extension to 30mph speed limit.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	n/a site too small to require affordable housing.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None proposed.	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for a SL Extension. No overriding constraints and site is reasonably located to access local services/facilities. Greenfield site, adjacent to the existing development boundary.

Site Visit Observations

Small site with no defined boundary on two sides. Nichols Road is narrow (single carriageway). However, small Development Boundary extension could be possible, with landscaping, particularly to the eastern boundary.

Local Plan Designations

Open Countryside, but adjoins the Development Boundary to the north.

Availability

Promoter states that the site is available.

Achievability

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation. Existing footpath has been diverted to aid this.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site a REASONABLE size for a settlement limit extension. The site is adjacent to the existing Development Boundary and within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities. However, development would need to respect the linear pattern of existing development on the western side of Nichols Road and include for appropriate landscaping, particularly to the eastern boundary. Development could potentially enhance the entrance to the village from the south. It has also been noted that a frontage access is preferred, rather than rear driveways like the adjoining scheme and that the footpath provided via the adjacent affordable housing development could be extended to serve this site.

Preferred Site: Yes (SL only)
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: November 2020

2. Barnham Broom, Kimberley, Carleton Forehoe, Runhall and Brandon Parva Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0018SL
Site address	Land north of Norwich Road, adj 101, Barnham Broom
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None, however the wider field/paddock was within the Settlement Limit in the 2003 Local Plan.
Planning History	2015/2827, two dwellings refused – outside settlement boundary, and erosion of rural character.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.18ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(g) Allocated site** **(h) SL extension**	SL Extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 2 dwellings at 11/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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Long, open frontage to Norwich Road (although on the inside of a bend), with footway running to site frontage. NCC Highways – Amber, subject to widening frontage carriageway to 5.5m and providing a 2.0m footway to connect with existing provision to west. NCC Highways meeting – sites at the eastern end of the village are well connected by footways.	
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Distance to Barnham Broom Primary School 400 metres along Norwich Road (footway for almost entire length) Distance to bus stop 400 metres Distance to shop / post office 970 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Barnham Broom sports pavilion and recreation area 200 metres Distance to The Bell Inn public house 980 metres	
Utilities Capacity	Green	Capacity TBC AW advise sewers crossing the site	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified as effecting the delivery of the site.	
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Greenfield site with no known issues. **SNC Env Services:** Land Quality - Having regard to the past use of the site along with 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	Surface water flood risk 1:1000 year on Norwich Road immediately outside the site, but not within the site itself.	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		Yare Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	No designated landscapes effected. However the site is quite open, with views across to fields to the north, so will impact on the character of the area.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Would be a continuation of the modern frontage development on this side of Norwich Road.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designated sites in close proximity, and the part of the site proposed for development has no immediate features.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	Non designated heritage assets to the south east	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Direct access to Norwich Road, one of the main roads serving the village and local bus route. **NCC Highways** – Amber, subject to widening frontage carriageway to 5.5m and providing a 2.0m footway to connect with existing provision to west. **NCC Highways meeting** – sites at the eastern end of the village are well connected by footways.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to the west, agricultural to the remaining boundaries. Telephone exchange in the far eastern corner of the site. **SNC Env Services:** Amenity - The site is adjacent to a Telephone Exchange which can be a source of noise and should be considered as part of any application.	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Impact on setting of non-designated heritage assets by removing their rural setting.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Safe access from Norwich Road would appear possible, although the site is on the inside of a slight bend	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock.	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, no obvious 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)	Low boundary to the road frontage and hedging to the adjoining property. The proposed site doesn't have a boundary as such, but the wider field has a number of mature trees on the boundary.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	The site itself has limited features.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Greenfield site with no obvious concerns.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across the site to the wider countryside beyond, giving the site amore rural feel than if it was more enclosed.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	A small settlement limit extension could continue the frontage development on this side of Norwich Road. The main concern would the impact on the rural character of the area and the setting on the non-designated heritage asset to the south east.	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	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)		N/A
When might the site be available for development?		
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)		
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)		
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?		
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?		

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for a settlement limit extension.

Site Visit Observations

A small settlement limit extension could continue the frontage development on this side of Norwich Road. The main concern would the impact on the rural character of the area and the setting on the non-designated heritage asset to the southeast.

Local Plan Designations

Open Countryside, but adjacent to the existing Development Limit.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable - Whilst the site is on the rural approach to the east end of Barnham Broom, and close to a non-designated heritage asset, it is also well located for access to local services and facilities with no on-site constraints; as such, as small Settlement Limit extension would be appropriate.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2110
Site address	Land south of Norwich Road, Barnham Broom
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.4 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(i) Allocated site** **(j) SL extension**	SL extension – five dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12 dwellings/ha as promoted.
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Access to the site should be achievable **NCC Highways** - Amber - Yes - subject to carriageway widening and footway at site frontage - footway to link with existing adjacent f/w to east and bus stop to west. Frontage trees may require removal. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.	**Amber**
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Distance to Barnham Broom Primary School 260 metres with footway Distance to bus stops 200 metres Distance to shop / post office 200 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Barnham Broom sports pavilion and recreation area 460 metres Distance to The Bell Inn public house 210 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Capacity TBC AW advise sewers crossing the site	Green
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 **SNC Env Services:** Land Quality - 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.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Road is at risk of surface water flooding and there is drainage ditch along the front of the site **LLFA** - Few or no constraints.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B6 Yare Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Limited landscape impact due to infill between existing development. Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Would continue existing linear pattern of development	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No protected sites within close proximity **NCC Ecology** – Green, but SSSI IRZ, potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets in close proximity **HES** - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Road is of reasonable standard and has footway **NCC Highways** - Amber - Yes - subject to carriageway widening and footway at site frontage - footway to link with existing adjacent f/w to east and bus stop to west. Frontage trees may require removal. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.	**Amber**
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential **SNC Env Services:** Amenity - No issues observed.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Potential impact on non-designated heritage assets at Manor Farm. Would continue linear form of development to east resulting in loss of gap between Manor Farm and part of the settlement to the east.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access likely to be achievable from Norwich Road, however confirmation needed that trees can be retained	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural with no potential 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)	Agricultural to south, residential to east and west. Woodland and further agricultural land on opposite side of road to north. No compatibility issues	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)	Avenue of trees running along northern boundary	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some habitat in trees and ditch to the front of the site.	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)	Overhead power line running east-west along south of 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 and across site from public highway	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Extension of built form would erode existing undeveloped gap between two parts of the settlement harming landscape character for limited benefit. As such it is not considered suitable for settlement limit extension	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
		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)		N/A
When might the site be available for development?		
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)	Potential carriageway widening and footway provision	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 – however the scale of the site is unlikely to require provision.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is promoted for a small Settlement Limit extension of circa 5 dwellings. The site is centrally located in the village and relatively unconstrained, with the main issues being loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, and surface water flood risk on the road in relation to the roadside ditch along the site frontage.

Site Visit Observations

It is likely that access could be achieved with either shared on multiple driveways, but care would been to be taken to minimise the loss of frontage trees which contribute to the character of the area. However, extension of built form would erode existing undeveloped gap between two parts of the settlement harming landscape character.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable - The site is a smaller road frontage element of a more substantial field. The site is central to the village and relatively unconstrained. However, frontage development would impact on the character of the area by closing the gap between the eastern and western parts of Barnham Broom and potentially lead to the loss of roadside trees; the gap also contributes to the setting of a non-designated heritage asset. The site would only be supported for a small-scale scheme which addresses these concerns.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 15 October 2020

3. Bawburgh Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0002SL
Site address	Land to the east of the Brambles, Stocks Hill, Bawburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.2ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(k) Allocated site** **(l) SL extension**	Settlement Limit Extension (The site has been submitted single dwelling)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	1 dwelling would equate to 1dph 5 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

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	Green	Access to the site is via Stocks Hill **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Amber. Ok, subject to satisfactory access visibility.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Primary School – 280m from the site. The school playing field backs on to the site Some local employment opportunities, including Bawburgh golf club. Other services available within neighbouring settlements.	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Public House – The Kings Head – approximately 300m from the site Village hall and recreation ground – approximately 50 from the site	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Local wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that there is mains water, sewerage and electricity available to the 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	There are no known contamination or ground stability issues **SNC ENV PROTECTION** – Green. 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. Amenity: - No significant issues noted.	Green
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 *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		A2: Yare/Tiffey Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Grade 3 agricultural land Site forms part of the rear garden to the Brambles. The site is screened from the wider landscape by existing boundary features.	Green
Townscape	Amber	Development would be located to the rear of the existing property and represent backland development. This would not reflect the form and character of development within the area.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	There are no known biodiversity or geodiversity concerns.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	The site is located within the conservation area and development has the potential to impact upon this. This may be mitigated through appropriate design. **HES** – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Development of the site is not considered to impact the functioning of the local road network. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Green. Ok, subject to satisfactory access visibility.	Green
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 in the conservation area and would be backland development	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available via Stock Hills	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential garden	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to the north, agricultural to the south, primary school playing field to the east	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerows surround site	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
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into and out of the site are limited by virtue of the existing site boundaries	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)	Site is located to the rear of existing property. Development of the site would introduce backland development which would not reflect the form and character of the area.	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)**
Conservation Area	Yes	
Development Boundary	Western half of site including existing property	
Norwich Southern Bypass Land Protection Zone		
Norwich Policy Area		
River Valley		
Open Countryside	Eastern half of site	
Conclusion	There are a number of landscape designations which affect this site	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)	No – proposal seeks a self build plot for the existing owners of The Brambles.	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)	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)	No	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	The site is being promoted for a single dwelling only and affordable housing is not applicable	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site has been promoted for a single dwelling only and has therefore been considered as a settlement limit extension. The site lies adjacent to the existing settlement limit boundary but would be backland development. No highways issues have been identified at this time. The site is within a number of landscape designations.

Site Visit Observations

The site is located to the rear of The Brambles. Development of the site would represent backland development which would not reflect the form and character of the area.

Local Plan Designations

The site is partially located within the existing Settlement Limits, is within the Conservation Area and the Landscape Bypass Protection Zone. The site is also within the River Valley designation.

Availability

Site is available for development

Achievability

Site is considered to be achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option as an extension to the existing settlement limit. The site is located to the rear of The Brambles and any development in this location would constitute uncharacteristic backland development. The site also lies within a number of landscape designations, including the Conservation Area.

UPDATE POST-REGULATION 18:
Following a review of the comments received during the Regulation 18 consultation, as well as ongoing discussions with technical consultees, the status of site SN0002SL has been reviewed and the site has been reclassified as a REASONABLE addition to the existing settlement limit. Although the site is located within several different landscape designations (as previously noted) it is well contained within the existing landscape and is adjacent to the preferred allocation site for Bawburgh, which will significantly change the context when developed. Due to existing form of development close to the site there would be limited opportunities for similar backland development to occur on nearby plots. For these reasons SN0002SL is considered to be a suitable addition to the existing settlement limit.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 7 January 2020

4. Brooke, Kirstead and Howe Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0020SL
Site address	Rear of 43 High Green, Brooke
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	Recent history relates to the existing dwelling at 43 High Green.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.11ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(m) Allocated site** **(n) SL extension**	SL extension Proposed for 1 dwelling.
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	9 dwellings/ha as promoted
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

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	Although r/o 43 High Green, in layout terms, the access would initially seem most appropriate via The Mallows Walk, however this may involve a ransom strip and from the permission for The Mallows it would appear that retention of trees on this boundary was an issue. Consequently the proposer has suggested access via the garden of 43 High Green. NCC Highways – Amber, subject to access from new estate road, which may require third party land.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	• Primary School - 625m • Shop/Post Office/Garage - 750m • Park Farm complex - 475m • Bus (King's Head stops, services inc X41 Bungay/Norwich) - 800m • Brooke Industrial Park - 2,500m Various other small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity - inc. vets, care home etc.	

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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		Tas Tributary Farmland.	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Does not affect a designated landscape. Small site between the recent redevelopment of 49 High Green for 14 dwellings (The Mallows	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Walk) and the existing properties fronting High Green. The main issue would be whether any development can be achieved without loss trees detrimental to the character of the area.	
Townscape	Amber	43 and 45 High Green are properties within substantial curtilages, fronting the road, but The Mallows Wallk is a higher density redevelopment of a brownfield site.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Currently domestic garden. However the trees on this boundary with The Mallows were an issue during that application and there are a number of trees on the site itself.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Wholly within the Conservation Area. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Highways agreed for The Mallows Walk, assume one additional dwelling would be acceptable. Similarly, another domestic access, or shared access with 43 High Green, could be possible. NCC Highways – Amber, subject to access from new estate road, which may require third party land.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to most boundaries, small part bordering arable field.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

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

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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 main concerns with the site are whether an access can be taken off The Mallows Walk, i.e. would there be a ransom strip and could existing trees be retained? or whether a direct access could be taken from High Green. Also the number of trees on site, which are covered by Conservation Area protection.	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
Conservation Area		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Adjoining the existing Development Boundary	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No, is the domestic garden of an existing dwelling.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?		
Comments:		Amber

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unlikely for a single dwelling	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Not applicable to site of this scale.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No.	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

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

Site Visit Observations

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

Local Plan Designations

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

Availability

Promoted by the site owner.

Achievability

No supporting information submitted.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

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

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGULATION18:

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

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: November 2020

5. Ditchingham, Broome, Hedenham and Thwaite Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2011SL
Site address	Land off Lamberts Way, Ditchingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2013/1212 – Extension of Lambert's way and erection of 4no. dwelling – dismissed at appeal
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.4 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(o) Allocated site** **(p) SL extension**	Settlement limit extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Proposal for 1 self-build dwelling.
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	Green	Access via Lamberts Way	Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Primary School within Ditchingham is approximately 950m from the site Village shop is approximately 350m from the site Limited employment opportunities Regular bus services operate between Diss and Beccles.	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		2 public houses Village Hall 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.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Recreation ground within Ditchingham	
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that this mains water and electricity to the 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	Amber	The are no known contamination or land stability issues Minerals & Waste – the site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site 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.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		River Valley Site is located on grade 3 agricultural land	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is located within the designated river valley. Previous refusal sites impact on the river valley as a reason for refusal.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Existing development to the south and east of the site, which would restrict wider views of the site.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Site is not considered to impact upon the historic environment HES score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Site is accessible from Lamberts Way. Development is not considered to impact the functioning of the local road network.	Green
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?	Site represents as extension from Lamberts Way, proposal is not considered to impact upon the townscape.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access to the site is from Lamberts Way	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Site is current in equestrian use as paddocks.	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 the south and east.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is generally flat	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Residential boundaries to south and east. Trees are located on the northern boundary.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees are located on the northern 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	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 reduced due to the existing residential development	N/A
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	The site is well related to the existing development. No overriding issues have been identified which would prevent and extension to the settlement boundary.	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)**
River Valley		N/A
Site of Archaeological Interest		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Site is located within the Waveney River Valley.	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)	Promoter has confirmed that the site is confirmed by a developer	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	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)	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)	No	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Site promoter has confirmed that they consider the site to be viable and that it could meet the policy costs	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 extension to the development. It has an existing access from Lamberts Way and is adjacent to residential development to the south and east.

Site Visit Observations

The site is well related to existing residential development. It is generally flat and is considered to represent a reasonable extension to the settlement boundary limit.

Local Plan Designations

The site is located within the Waveney River Valley, however this is the same for all land outside the development boundary in Ditchingham

Availability

The landowner has confirmed that the site is available.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is suitable for a Settlement Limit extension. The site would be accessible from Lamberts Way and is adjacent to residential development to the south and the east. The promoter has noted that they would wish to build one self-build dwelling. dwelling on the site, although the site is a sufficient size to allow a larger number of properties

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 23 July 2020

6. Little Melton and Great Melton Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1046 REV
Site address	Glenhaven, Great Melton Road, Little Melton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Only application that directly relates to the main part of the site is for equestrian use (2014/1716)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.69 hectares (including Glenhaven)
Promoted Site Use, including **(q) Allocated site** **(r) SL extension**	Residential use, no numbers specified but could involve demolition of Glenhaven
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

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	Various access options are all constrained and may not be deliverable **NCC HIGHWAYS – Red** Acceptable access does not appear feasible, Gt Melton Rd is narrow with no f/w. No safe walking route to school. **NCC HIGHWAYS** (meeting Jan 2021) No safe walking route to school. Requires demolishing existing bungalow to achieve access	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Distance to Little Melton Primary School 480 metres Distance to bus service 230 metres Distance to shop 780 metres Local employment 1km	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Little Melton village hall and recreation ground 430 metres (if access can be achieved via Ringwood Close, however within 1.8km if not) Distance to The Village Inn public house 530 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	To be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available. No gas supply.	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	Green	No identified surface water flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Settled Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is contained within the settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land. **SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER-**	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		site is surrounded by established vegetation and potential ecological issues; would suggest SL site rather than allocation; development on this site could appear contrived due to its irregular shape.	
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would be in keeping with adjoining mixed pattern of development	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	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**	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential properties surround site	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	If satisfactory access could be achieved, then development here could be acceptable given the surrounding recent development	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Options for access are through demolition of existing dwelling or through new development. Of the latter option, access from Limes Close would involve loss of open space and may not be deliverable whilst there may be an option from next to No28 Ringwood Close but it is possible there would be a ransom strip.	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 properties surround site with no compatibility issues.	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)	Fencing and hedging with some trees.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is well contained with limited views of site.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Site is not suitable for allocation due to size, but if access can be achieved then suitable for development as windfall development within the settlement limit.	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		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 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?	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. 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 requirement will depend on size of site. No evidence of viability of affordable housing has been provided	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is not suitable for allocation due to size, but if access can be achieved then suitable for development as windfall development within the settlement limit.

Site Visit Observations

Site contained by existing development, but with constrained access options.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered REASONABLE to be included within the settlement limit, subject to creating and ensuring a satisfactory access can be achieved**.** The site is situated to the rear of residential development on all sides and appears to be landlocked. However, the promoter has advised that the proposal would include the demolition of 'Glenhaven' dwelling to the south to allow access to the site. The Highway Authority have raised concerns with the access and whether a suitable access could be achieved, and the local road network is unsuitable. These concerns would need to be demonstrated prior to development.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

Following the completion of the recent development at Limes Close, to the northwest, a potential opportunity exists for an access through the open space on that development, which would be preferable in highways terms. The site remains preferred for a Settlement Limit extension.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

7. Needham, Brockdish, Starston and Wortwell Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5045SL
Site address	Land north east of High Road, Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.3ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(s) Allocated site** **(t) SL extension**	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	8
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	Open frontage to High Road with no restrictions, appears that visibility could be achieved (conifer trees referred to in highways response have recently been removed). NCC Highways – Green. Subject to satisfactory access, may require tree removal. Footway widening required for full site frontage. NCC Highways meeting - Need to improve the frontage footway and extend the 30mph, however there will be no allocation policy for a site of this scale, so will need to be dealt with through the application process	Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment	Amber	Distance to Alburgh and Denton Primary School (not catchment school) 2,650m Bus service passes site with bus stops in close proximity along High Road, linking to market town in the Waveney Valley.	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport			
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	N/A	Distance to recreation ground (with formal sports facilities) and community centre 1,050m Distance to The Wortwell Bell Public House 630 metres 500m to Pura Vida garden centre/coffee shop.	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utility capacity to be confirmed Environment Agency: Green	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unknown, unlikely as is an undeveloped piece of land. NCC Minerals & Waste - site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that - future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		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 flood risk on the site. Flood Zones 2 & 3, and Internal Drainage Board Area to south-east across High Road. LLFA – Green. Surface water risk would not prevent development. Standard information required at planning stage. The site is adjacent to major surface water flooding and in proximity of two major flow paths. This must be considered in the site assessment.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	A5 Waveney Rural River Valley Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in identified river valley landscape area. This edge of Wortwell is sparsely developed and the site provides a gap before the built-up area; development would have an impact on the landscape. The road frontage is now open following the recent felling of a substantial conifer hedge that gave a significant green appearance. There are some native trees on the adjacent site and additional planting proposed. If this site was to be considered it may require	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		new tree planting between it and the listed building to compensate for the removal of its green setting. SNC Landscape Officer – Trees along site frontage removed earlier this year; no particular landscape issue identified.	
Townscape	Amber	Development of site could be within the pattern of development along High Road although typically it is more sporadic and less dense as it moves out of the village. SNC Heritage Officer – Chapel set back from frontage; new development would not necessarily need to be set along the same building line as chapel would have been set back.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	RNR off to rear (north-west) along A143. Also possible habitat within site and across High Road where water is present. Would require investigation. NCC Ecologist: Amber. No PROW nearby. No priority habitat onsite but should avoid habitat loss. Residential development of 10 units or more, or any residential developments outside of existing settlements/ urban areas with a total net gain in residential units would require consultation with Natural England as site in SSSI IRZ. Amber risk zone for great crested newts. Norfolk Wildlife Trust: This site is adjacent to Roadside Nature Reserve (RNR) 14, Wortwell. RNRs are designated for their nature conservation value, and we recommend that any site allocation policy here includes reference to the RNR and the need to preserve it, should highway works such as	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		visibility splays that may impact on the RNR be needed.	
Historic Environment	Amber	United Reformed Church Listed Building to south with open aspect to site, would impact on its setting. Site of Archaeological Interest runs off-site, along the A143 to north-west. HES – Amber SNC Heritage Officer - The existing car park and access already provide a good physical separation between the site and the listed church, and the church is orientated mainly to be viewed from the front. No real issues, but require any buildings to be designed sympathetically to the setting of the chapel as still quite close proximity in terms of context.	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 – Amber. Subject to satisfactory access, may require tree removal. Footway widening required for full site frontage.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Church and graveyard to south, large new tarmaced car-park, sporadic residential to north. Roads either side.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments 11/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Adjacent to a listed church, and completely within its setting/view, and it is an undeveloped gap which makes a positive contribution to the character of the area. Therefore, it will have townscape and landscape impact of development in this location.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Appears that it can be achieved, it would mean removing some of the frontage hedge.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Unused grassland, former garden to property to north.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Church to south, residential to north with garden between the site and the road (A143). Car-park to south at an elevated position would need addressing to prevent lights and noise disturbing nay residential properties.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	There is a slope west-east towards the High Road, with the property to the north being at a higher level and the car-park to the south also at a higher level on a bank overlooking the site. The frontage is at road level.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Conifer hedge has been removed from the road frontage and deposited on site, hedging to rear. Open to north and south.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some hedges, conifers were good habitat for nesting birds, this should be mitigated.	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 along path at frontage.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments 11/02/22	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 open. The site is still a green gap in the road frontage. There are public views from the church into the site from the south. There are now long views from the site over the river valley to the east.	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)	Site is in the River Valley landscape area and it is sparsely developed so a group of dwellings here would have some impact on the landscape. The road frontage creates a green gap looking towards the river valley. There would be a visual impact on the setting of the listed church.	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)**
Waveney River Valley		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)	No – have had enquiries.	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate) Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Immediately	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Promoter states site is deliverable but no evidence to support this.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Standard access improvements and also significant native landscaping, not just within dwelling plots.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it will be provided but no evidence of viability.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site forms a gap in the built development fronting High Road, between the listed United Reform Chapel to the southwest and a small group of dwellings to the northeast. Recent removal of a substantial conifer hedge on the road frontage, and the implementation of the approved car park for the chapel have changed the immediate vicinity of the site. Whilst any scheme will need to be sensitive to the listed building, this would not prevent development of the site. A Roadside Nature Reserve immediately is close by, and the site is rated amber for the possible presence of Great Crested Newts, consequently ecology will also be an important consideration.

Site Visit Observations

The site is in the River Valley landscape area, and it is sparsely developed, so a group of dwellings here would have some impact on the landscape however the addition of a car park (associated with the Chapel) adjacent to the site has altered the context of the site to a degree, as has the recent removal of the frontage trees from the site.

The road frontage creates a green gap looking towards the river valley. There would be a visual impact on the setting of the listed church.

Local Plan Designations

River Valley

Availability

The site is considered to be available

Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

SN5045SL is considered to be a REASONABLE addition to the existing settlement limit which lies adjacent to the south of the promoted site. Potential impacts on the landscape and the adjacent listed building have been identified but it is considered that this could be appropriately addressed within any subsequent planning application. Similarly ecological surveys and mitigation measures would be required to support any development on the site.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 17 May 2022

8. Seething and Mundham Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0406SL
Site address	Land to West of Seething Street, Seething
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	L/4745 Residential development. Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.46ha (1.169ha across 3 sites)
Promoted Site Use, including **(u) Allocated site** **(v) SL extension**	Settlement extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Residential development of approximately 29 dwellings across 3 sites - 25dph (GNLP assessment suggests 12 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

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	Potential access constraints existing hedge/trees to site frontage. Visibility unlikely onto seething Road, will require removal of front hedge and access will require removal of mature trees. **NCC Highways** – Red, visibility unlikely onto Seething Road. Visibility would require the complete removal of the frontage hedge and to provide an access road would require removal of mature trees. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision. No footway to the village school. **NCC Highways meeting** - small infill frontage development would not raise concerns (SN0588SL already has permission for similar)	Red Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Village Shop 305m Bus stop within 1.03km and is on the bus route for Anglian 86 Primary School is within 724m No footpaths	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall 538m Recreational ground/play area next to village hall	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, 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	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 1-100 between the pond and the road and 1-1000covering the northeast corner of the site.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated. Development would require the removal of exiting trees which are protected by virtue of their location within the conservation area. **Landscape meeting** - There are mature trees on the site and along the site frontage. A tree survey would be required to assess these and determine the quantum of acceptable development on the site however it may be acceptable for 1/2 dwellings.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The site is 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 there hedgerows are a key feature. This part is characterised by a linear form of development. Development boundary is located to the east on the opposite site of the road. The development would have a	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. Especially given it is within the Conservation Area.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development could have detrimental impact on Seething Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings. The Walnuts and Breydon Cottage are located to the southeast separated by existing residential properties and the road. Mere Thatched Barn is located to the north separated by Mere Farm **HES** - Amber	Amber
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 the road network may not be reasonably mitigated. Narrow carriage way and no footway **NCC Highways** – Red, visibility unlikely onto Seething Road. Visibility would require the complete removal of the frontage hedge and to provide an access road would require removal of mature trees. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision. No footway to the village school. **NCC Highways meeting** - small infill frontage development would not raise concerns (SN0588SL already has permission for similar)	Red Amber
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?	Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB's and Conservation area. 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. Especially given it is within the Conservation Area.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints as there are existing hedge/trees to site frontage.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural Grade 3	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and 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)	Trees/hedgerows to east and west. Residential to the south and north.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant tree at top northeast corner. Trees within the site and on southern and western boundaries. As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations. Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.	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)	Overhead lines run along the road boundary	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 limited due to existing residential development bounding the site to the south and north and existing hedges/trees screen the site from the road. However, the development would be visible across the open landscape.	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)	Opposite the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated. The site is limited in its developable area due to the surface water flooding and pond on the site.	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 Likely surface Water flooding mitigation, plus pond within the site.	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

Considered suitable for a settlement extension subject to mitigation of constraints and confirmation from NCC Highways, Landscape Architect and Heritage officer that the site is acceptable in highway, impact on existing hedgerow/trees, and heritage terms. But for a linear type of development.

Site Visit Observations

Opposite the development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated. The site is limited in its developable area due to the surface water flooding and pond on the site.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within 5 years.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified other than the overhead lines which run along the road boundary.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable – Land to the west of Seething Road does not currently have a Settlement Limit south of Pear Tree House. South of Mere Farm three small Settlement Limit extension sites have been proposed, SN0406SL, SN0587SL and SN0588SL, the latter now has permission for two dwellings.
SN0406SL is considered reasonable for a settlement extension, to accommodate a linear type of development, subject to mitigation of constraints in terms of highways, impact on existing hedgerow/trees, and heritage. Given the on-site constraints, this may be limited to 1 or 2 dwellings. In combination with SN0587SL and SN0588SL, this would require a new section of Settlement Limit on the west side of Seething Road, from Mere Farm to The Cottage.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 4 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0587SL
Site address	Land to West of Seething Street, Seething
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	L/4746 Residential development. Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.36ha (1.169ha across 3 sites)
Promoted Site Use, including **(w) Allocated site** **(x) SL extension**	Settlement extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Residential development of approximately 29 dwellings across 3 sites - 25dph (GNLP assessment suggests 9 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	Visibility likely to be achievable but may require the removal of an existing mature tree. Access likely to require carriageway widening across the site frontage and frontage footway **NCC Highways** - Amber, visibility likely to be achievable but may require the removal of an existing mature tree. Access likely to require carriageway widening across the site frontage and frontage footway. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision. No footway to the village school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities	Amber	Village Shop 488m Bus stop within 1.18km and is on the bus route for Anglian 86 Primary School is within 873m No footpaths	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
○ Peak-time public transport			
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall 685m Recreational ground/play area next to village hall	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	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1. Surface Water Flood Hazard and Surface water Flooding depth 1-100 and 1-30 around the pond. Surface Water Flood depth 1-1000 in the centre of the site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated unless with a lower density.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The site is 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 there hedgerows are a key feature. This part is characterised by a linear form of development. Development boundary is located on the opposite side of the road to the east. 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 Especially being adjacent to the Conservation Area.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	Development could have detrimental impact on Seething Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings. Adjacent to Seething Conservation Area to the east and separated by existing residential properties to the north. The Walnuts and Breydon Cottage two listed buildings are located to the east separated by the road. Therefore the development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB's but could be reasonably mitigated. Careful consideration required to the views into the Conservation Area. **HES** - Amber	Amber
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 road network may not be reasonably mitigated. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision. **NCC Highways** - Red, visibility likely to be achievable but may require the removal of an existing mature tree. Access likely to require carriageway widening across the site frontage and frontage footway. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision. No footway to the village school.	Red
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?	Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB's and Conservation Area. 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. Especially given it is adjacent to the Conservation Area.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints as there are existing hedge/trees to site frontage.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural grade 3	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and 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)	Hedge/trees to frontage – east. Trees/hedges to west. Pond to south and residential property. Residential property to north. Public footpath to the south.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant tree along eastern boundary. As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations. Pond to the south. Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.	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)	Overhead line running along road boundary	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 limited due to existing residential development bounding the site to the south and north and existing hedges/trees screen the site from the road. However, the development would be visible across the open landscape.	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)	Opposite the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated.	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?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Considered suitable for a settlement extension subject to mitigation of constraints and confirmation from NCC Highways, Landscape Architect and Heritage officer that the site is acceptable in highway, impact on existing hedgerow/trees, and heritage terms. But for a linear type of development.

Site Visit Observations

Opposite the development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within 5 years.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified other than the overhead lines which run along the road boundary.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable – Land to the west of Seething Road does not currently have a Settlement Limit south of Pear Tree House. South of Mere Farm three small Settlement Limit extension sites have been proposed, SN0406SL, SN0587SL and SN0588SL, the latter now has permission for two dwellings.
SN0587SL is considered reasonable for a settlement extension, to accommodate a linear type of development (approx. 5 properties), subject to mitigation of constraints in terms of highways, the impact on existing hedgerows/trees, and heritage. In combination with SN0406SL and SN0588SL, this would require a new section of Settlement Limit on the west side of Seething Road, from Mere Farm to The Cottage.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 4 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0588SL
Site address	Land to West of Seething Street, Seething
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	1977/0008 Construction of a bungalow. Refused 2004/0137 Erection of two new 4 bedroom detached houses and double garages. Refused 2012/1563 Outline for 2 new houses. Refused 2017/1442 2 new detached dwellings with attached single garages. Refused 2018/1033 2 new detached dwellings with single garages. Approved 2019/2352 New house and bungalow with garaging (revised application from 2018/1033). Approved 2020/0870 Variation of condition 2 of 2019/2352 - change design of both plots and submission of materials for each plot. Approved
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.31ha (1.169ha across 3 sites)
Promoted Site Use, including **(y) Allocated site** **(z) SL extension**	Settlement extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Residential development of approximately 29 dwellings across 3 sites - 25dph (GNLP assessment suggests 8 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

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	Visibility unachievable onto Seething Road. Provision of an access would require the complete removal of the frontage hedge and to provide an access road would require removal of mature trees. **NCC Highways** – Red, visibility unachievable onto Seething Road. Provision of an access would require the complete removal of the frontage hedge and to provide an access road would require removal of mature trees. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision. No footway to the village school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment	Amber	Village Shop 617m Bus stop within 1.3km and is on the bus route for Anglian 86 Primary School is within 990m No footpaths	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport			
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall 818m Recreational ground/play area next to village hall	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, 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	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1.	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development for more than approved would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated. Development would require the removal of hedge.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The site is 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 there hedgerows are a key feature. This part is characterised by a linear form of development. The development boundary is located to the east on the opposite side of the road. The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could not be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. The site appropriate development of two plots has already been granted planning permission.	Amber/Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development could have detrimental impact on Seething Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings which could be reasonably mitigated. Outside the Conservation area separated by existing land uses.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Breydon Cottage and The Walnuts two listed buildings are located to the northeast separated by intervening land uses. **HES** - Amber	
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 the road network may not be reasonably mitigated. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision. **NCC Highways** – Red, visibility unachievable onto Seething Road. Provision of an access would require the complete removal of the frontage hedge and to provide an access road would require removal of mature trees. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision. No footway to the village school.	Red
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?	Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB's and Conservation area. The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could not be reasonably mitigated.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints , above the two dwellings that have been granted in visibility terms.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Was Agricultural Grade 3 but commencement on site to implement the two consented dwellings	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and 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)	Trees/hedgerows to west, part of hedgerow to east removed for consented development. Residential to the south and north.	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.	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)	Overhead lines run along the road boundary	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 limited due to existing residential development bounding the site to the south and north and existing hedges/trees. As the development has commenced the existing hedgerow has been removed opening the site for views	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	from the road.	
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)	Opposite the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village, the planning permission for two dwellings has been implemented and a denser development would harm the setting of the village and the townscape.	Amber/Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
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?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable for further development due to potential adverse impacts on setting of the village and Townscape and highway safety.

Site Visit Observations

Opposite the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village, the planning permission for two dwellings has been implemented and a denser development would harm the setting of the village and the townscape.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within 5 years.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified other than the overhead lines which run along the road boundary.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable – Land to the west of Seething Road does not currently have a Settlement Limit south of Pear Tree House. South of Mere Farm three small Settlement Limit extension sites have been proposed, SN0406SL, SN0587SL and SN0588SL, the latter now has permission for two dwellings. Whilst SN0588SL raises some concerns in terms of impact on the rural setting of the village, as the site has permission and the CIL commencement has been paid, it is considered reasonable to include. In combination with SN0406SL and SN0587SL, this would require a new section of Settlement Limit on the west side of Seething Road, from Mere Farm to The Cottage.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 4 December 2020

9. Tivetshall St Mary and Tivetshall St Margaret Cluster

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3002
Site address	Land south of Green Pastures, west of The Street, Tivetshall St. Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic approval & refusal for residential
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.18 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(aa) Allocated site** **(bb) SL extension**	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 4 dwellings = 22 dph (25 dph = 5 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

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	Existing access via adjoining host property as residential curtilage. New separate access would be needed onto The Street, could mirror those opposite. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. Limited frontage precludes safe access being provided. No footways in the village linking to the catchment primary school. The site is considered to be remote from services. *(Highways meeting: The road gets narrow further south along The Street. Potential to square up the frontage and reflect what is on the opposite side of the road, no real issues as a SL extension.)*	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	430m walk to primary school Post office and limited employment opportunities within 1800m Peak bus service within 1800m	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		550m walk to Village hall, recreation ground and village groups PH within 1800m	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 along eastern boundary. No UKPN constraints. AW advise sewers crossing this site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site lies outside of the proposed fibre installation area.	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 ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is at low risk of flooding	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. **SNC Landscape Officer** - no issues.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of HA to south. Impact may be mitigated. **HES** – Amber **SNC Heritage Officer** - No objection to settlement extension.	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC; the road gets narrow further along The Street. No real issues to SL extension. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. Limited frontage precludes safe access being provided. No footways in the village linking to the catchment primary school. The site is considered to be remote from services. *(Highways meeting: The road gets narrow further south along The Street. Potential to square up the frontage and reflect what is on the opposite side of the road, no real issues as a SL extension.)*	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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?	Well separated from HA to south on eastern side of The Street. Impacts of developing this site likely to be reasonably mitigated. If combined with adjacent parcels, cumulative impact should be carefully assessed.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access shared with adjoining property. Appears that adequate visibility for a new access can be achieved onto The Street but will require loss of hedgerow.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Amenity; 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 to north and east. Agricultural to west and south – compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Established hedgerow including trees in southern boundary. PRoW along this boundary, but outside of site.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Established hedgerow including trees in 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)	O/H lines along eastern boundary.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site prominent in views along The Street. Visually contained form wider views from west and south.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Site close to primary school and limited local services. Lack of continuous footpath which is characteristic of settlement. As promoted would reflect pattern of development on eastern side of The Street. Landscape impacts could be limited by planted boundaries to west and south. NCC to confirm traffic impacts on The Street and feasibility of safe access.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Approach by developers	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	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, a new access onto The Street would be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No. It is under the size threshold.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Suitable for SL extension as promoted as it rounds off development. This is subject to satisfactory access and design, landscaping to boundaries and re-location of utilities and taking account of the existing form and character of the village.

Site Visit Observations

Site close to primary school and limited local services. Lack of continuous footpath which is characteristic of settlement. As promoted would reflect pattern of development on eastern side of The Street. Landscape impacts could be limited by planted boundaries to west and south. NCC to confirm traffic impacts on The Street and feasibility of safe access.

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 to be a reasonable extension to the existing settlement limit. It is located relatively close to the school and village hall and is immediately adjacent to the settlement limit to the north and opposite the settlement limit to the east. The site is currently residential curtilage and already appears as part of the form of the village, albeit with a strong frontage hedge line which would need to be partially removed for access. New development in this location would read as part of the existing village fronting The Street, mirroring the residential development directly opposite. It would be a rounding-off of the built form without incursion into open countryside as the southern boundary is delineated by a public footpath.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 03 December 2020

10. Toft Monks, Aldeby, Haddiscoe, Wheatacre and Burgh St Peter

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4015
Site address	Land west of Mill Road, Burgh St Peter
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.92 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including **(cc) Allocated site** **(dd) 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

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	Access options are constrained by nature of road **NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber** Access would require removal of trees at frontage.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ 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 Distance to bus service 250 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Burgh St Peter village hall 500 metres Distance to White Lion public house 600 metres	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	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	Identified surface water flood risk on highway and southern boundary	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would result in erosion of rural character to south of settlement. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Creation of estate development would be out of character	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity **NCC ECOLOGY – Green** SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net gain	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Possible non-designated heritage asset on opposite side of road to east **NCC HES - Amber**	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained as narrow lanes with no footways	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential **NCC HIGHWAYS – Red** Network - narrow roads. No feasible safe walking route to school.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Allocation of site is likely to require a small estate development that would be out of character with linear character of development to north.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Vehicular access should be achievable from Mill Road. Pedestrian access is poor.	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)	Residential properties to north and south-east. Otherwise agricultural land. No compatibility issues.	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)	Largely open boundary onto Mill Roads. Trees and hedging on other boundaries	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)	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	Open views across site from Mill Road	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Development of site is likely to adversely affect rural character by intruding development south into the open landscape and introducing estate development. Also remote from many services, including primary school	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
		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:		

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 considered as part of the settlement limit extension. Highways have raised concerns over the lack of footpath provision and that the site is some distance from the nearest school.

Site Visit Observations

Site is to the south of a linear pattern of development. It is currently open countryside to that contributes to the rural character of the area.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is located to the south of the existing development boundary and is considered to be a reasonable option for a settlement limit extension. Development would need to be subject to achieving a satisfactory access, which may result in the loss of hedgerows, and this would need to be addressed prior to development. Development on this site would need to respect the linear pattern of existing development to the north, thereby reducing the overall number of units achievable on the site.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected:

Date Completed: 5 January 2021