

Alburgh & Denton Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

Contents

SN00168	3
SN00193	11
SN4011	20
SN4031SL	31

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN00168
Site address	Land at north of Upland Terrace Council houses, Norwich Road, Denton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.13ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	4 Dwellings But given the size of the site put forward would 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:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential access constraints existing hedge/trees to site frontage. A narrow Road with no footpaths.</p> <p>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.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	<p>No village Shop</p> <p>Bus stop within 1.41km (Trunch Hill, turns around at Chapel Corner) and is on the bus route for Anglian 84</p> <p>Primary School is within 3.73km</p>	

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall 1.09km Recreational ground/play area 1.11km Pre-school at the primary school Denton Community Post Office 1.41km (Thursdays in vestry of Chapel)	Amber
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	Surface Water Flooding to the south and east running along the frontage with the highway but not on the site.	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B4 – Waveney Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated.	Amber

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Townscape	Green	The site is detached from the main part of the village. The site is currently used as an agricultural field. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Mutts Farm located to the west, Glebe farm to the east, Old Kings head to the northeast. All separated by intervening land uses; therefore, any impact could be reasonably mitigated. 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 local road network and junction capacity which may not be reasonably mitigated. NCC advised that the local road network is considered unsuitable in terms of road capacity and lack of footpath provision. 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.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and Residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB' s.</p> <p>The site is detached from the main part of the village. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character. Therefore, the development would have a detrimental impact on townscape, which could not be reasonably mitigated.</p>	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Potential access constraints. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on surrounding road network.	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural field Grade 3	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Agricultural and residential	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Public right of way running from the southwest corner along the western boundary. Trees/hedgerows to the boundaries. Residential to the part of the south	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Possibly significant trees along the 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.	
<i>Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)</i>	No	

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Prominent in views from surrounding road network, public footpath and the surrounding landscape due to boundaries of the site being lower hedgerows.	
Initial site visit conclusion <i>(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)</i>	Not adjacent to the development boundary, separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network, public footpath. 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		
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	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	X
	Within 5 years	
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Potential 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

CONCLUSION

Suitability Not considered suitable due to potential adverse impacts on landscape and separation for the main part of the village, poor connectivity along narrow, rural roads to local services/facilities.

Site Visit Observations Separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network, public footpath. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

Local Plan Designations Within open countryside and not adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability Promoter has advised availability immediately

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Unreasonable – The site as promoted extends to over 3ha, although the site promoter has indicated that a much smaller scheme (circa 4 dwellings) is being sought. Notwithstanding this, the site would extend a small group of former Council Houses in a location which is detached from the main part of the village (which lies to the south) and would erode the rural character of the locality. The site is well beyond 3km from the catchment primary school and connectivity to local services is poor.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 25/11/2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN00193
Site address	Land at Upland Farm, Denton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	DE/6450 Site for a bungalow and garage. Refused DE/3513 Use of land for the erection of 5 dwellings. Refused DE/3497 use of land for residential development. Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	5.64ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	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:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No

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:

Locally Designated Green Space	No
--------------------------------	----

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential access constraints existing hedge/trees to site frontage. A narrow Road with no footpaths.</p> <p>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.</p>	Amber

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	Red	<p>No village Shop</p> <p>Bus stop within 1.41km (Trunch Hill, turns around at Chapel Corner) and is on the bus route for Anglian 84</p> <p>Primary School is within 3.73km</p>	
		<p>Village Hall 1.09km</p> <p>Recreational ground/play area 1.11km</p> <p>Pre-school at the primary school</p> <p>Denton Community Post Office 1.41km (Thursdays in vestry of Chapel)</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site. No – mains sewage (which conflicts with the promoter on the site opposite) existing properties use a septic tank.	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	Surface water flooding 1-1000 and Surface Water flood hazard peppered around the sites. 1:100 and 1:30 to the middle section of 1172 and 1960.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Rural River Valley	

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT				
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Tributary Farmland	X	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland		
		Settled Plateau Farmland		
		Plateau Farmland		
		Valley Urban Fringe		
		Fringe Farmland		
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B4 – Waveney Tributary Farmland		
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated.		Amber
Townscape	Green	The site is detached from the main part of the village. The site is currently used as an agricultural field. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.		Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.		Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Mutts Farm located to the west separated by intervening land uses. Old Kings Head located to north separated by the highways. Glebe Farm is located below 1960 separated from the proposed sites by outbuildings and Upland Farm complex. Therefore, any impact could be reasonably mitigated. HES - Amber		Amber

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Amber
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on functioning of local road network and junction capacity which may not be reasonably mitigated. NCC advised that the local road network is considered unsuitable in terms of road capacity and lack of footpath provision.</p> <p>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.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural, residential and Ashton Motors small commercial garage/mots is located to the western boundary adjacent the highway.	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB' s.</p> <p>The site is detached from the main part of the village. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character. Therefore, the development would have a detrimental impact on townscape, which could not be reasonably mitigated.</p>	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Potential access constraints. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on surrounding road network	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural field Grade 3	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Agricultural, residential and Ashton Motors small commercial garage/mots is located to the western boundary adjacent the highway.	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedgerow and trees to the eastern and northern boundaries with the highway. Field boundaries separate the parcels of land. Residential to the south and Ashton motors to the west.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Possibly significant trees along the 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.	
<i>Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)</i>	Overhead lines run along the western highway boundary with the sites	

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Prominent in views from surrounding road network, and the surrounding landscape due to boundaries of the site with the highway being lower hedgerows. Some parcels more contained within the site, due to boundary treatment and location.	
Initial site visit conclusion <i>(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)</i>	Not adjacent to the development boundary, separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network. 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		
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		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	X	Green
	Within 5 years		
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Potential 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

CONCLUSION

Suitability. Not considered suitable due to potential adverse impacts on landscape and separation for the main part of the village, poor connectivity along narrow, rural roads to local services/facilities.

Site Visit Observations Separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

Local Plan Designations Within open countryside and not adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability Promoter has advised availability immediately

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: NOT REASONABLE – The site as promoted extends to over 5ha; however, even a smaller element of the site would be detached from the main part of the village (which lies to the south) and would effectively be an isolated group of dwellings in the countryside, eroding the rural character of the locality. The site is well beyond 3km from the catchment primary school and connectivity to local services is poor.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 25/11/2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4011
Site address	Land to South and West of Church Road Alburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	DE/9944 Outline residential development – Refused DE/9943 Outline residential development – Refused DE/9942 Outline residential development – Refused 1974/0193 Residential development - Refused 1978/2595 Erection of Detached House and Double Garage – Refused 1978/2594 Erection of Detached House and Double Garage - Refused 1980/2529 Site for Ten Dwellings - Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.96ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Minimum of 12 dwellings therefore assuming 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:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No

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:

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		<p>Potential access constraints existing hedge/trees to site frontage.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Green, narrow carriageway, no footway.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting – Site has plenty of frontage to form a safe access(es). Not an appropriate location for estate scale development/estate roads. Therefore, frontage only from private drives (up to 12/13 dwellings total), ideally turning the corner to maximise the benefits of any frontage improvements. Roads are not ideal for walking – however, Church Road/Low Road are wide enough for 2 cars to pass.</p>	Amber/Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport		No village Shop Bus stop within 232m and is on the bus route for Anglian 84 Primary School is within 1.1km No footpaths	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall 264m Recreational ground/play area next to village hall 264m Public House 2.59m (A143) Pre-school at the primary school	Green
Utilities Capacity		Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure		Promoter advises water, sewage and electricity available to site.	Green

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
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		<p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.</p> <p>SNC Environmental Services Land Quality, Green:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 ○ 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		<p>Flood zone 1 with Small area of 1-100, 1-1000, 1 – 30 and Surface Water Flood Risk on the southern boundary and Surface Water Flood Hazard .</p> <p>LLFA - Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage.</p> <p>AW advise sewers crossing the site</p>	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	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment		<p>Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>SNC Landscape Meeting - Significant landscape concerns about this site due to the loss of the frontage hedgerow that would result. Loss of the hedgerow would conflict with Policy DM4.8.</p>	Amber
Townscape		Adjacent to development boundary, area characterised by linear development opposite and to the northwest. Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated, should the development be a linear form.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity		<p>Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Ecology – Green, potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	Amber

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

<p>Historic Environment</p>		<p>Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB located to the south but could be reasonably mitigated. Alburgh Old Hall Farm is a grade 2 listed building, the promoted site forms part of its setting. Archaeology on the listed building site to the south. All Saints Church Grade 1 and War memorial Grade 11 to the east separated by the highway. Church Farm Grade 11 to northeast and Old Forge Cottage Grade 11 opposite side of the road to northwest.</p> <p>SNC Heritage & Design There are some good views across the field towards the Farmhouse – which also includes views of the church tower, which can be seen to the left. Would suggest excluding the area west of the driveway.</p> <p>Area east of the driveway, amber for heritage– it would be good to leave some space for the setting of LB</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	<p>Amber</p>
-----------------------------	--	--	--------------

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Open Space		Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads		<p>Potential impact on functioning of Church Road/road network may not be reasonably mitigated. Narrow carriage way and no footway</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, narrow carriageway, no footway.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting – Site has plenty of frontage to form a safe access(es). Not an appropriate location for estate scale development/estate roads. Therefore, frontage only from private drives (up to 12/13 dwellings total), ideally turning the corner to maximise the benefits of any frontage improvements. Roads are not ideal for walking – however, Church Road/Low Road are wide enough for 2 cars to pass.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses		<p>Agricultural/residential</p> <p>SNC Environmental Services Amenity, Green: - No issues observed.</p>	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB' s, particularly Alburgh Old Hall Farm . Noted that the other Listed buildings are separated by roads.</p> <p>This part of the village is characterised by linear development opposite and to the northwest. Therefore, the development would have a detrimental impact on townscape, however this could be reasonably mitigated, should the development be a linear form along the site frontage.</p>	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Potential access constraints as there are existing hedge/trees to site frontage.	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural Grade 3	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Agricultural and residential	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Trees/hedgerows to north and east. Residential to the part of the south and west with remainder trees/vegetation.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Possibly significant trees along the northern and eastern 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.	

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Utilities and Contaminated Land</i> – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	None	
<i>Description of the views</i> (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 west and existing hedges/trees screen the site from Church Road. However, the development would be visible from the surrounding road network.	
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 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		
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		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	X	Green
	Within 5 years		
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	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

CONCLUSION

Suitability Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services, although there are no footways, the roads are generally two car widths, and the routes to the school and village hall are relatively short. The site is within the setting of the Grade II Listed Alburgh Old Hall Farm, and within the wider setting of the Grade I listed church. The extensive frontage hedgerows are also a limitation, as is a small area of 1:30 year surface water flood risk

Site Visit Observations 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 be mitigated. Concern that the site has extensive roadside hedges would need to be removed to maintain the linear, frontage characteristics of the village.

Local Plan Designations Within open countryside adjacent to development boundary

Availability Promoter has advised availability immediately

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Unreasonable – The site is relatively well located for access to the school and village hall and creating accesses for frontage accesses (although improvements sought by Highways could urbanise this rural location). Linear, frontage development would also be in keeping with the character of this part of the village; however, this form of development would require the loss of extensive roadside hedging. The site is in the setting of a listed building and also has views across to the Grade 1 listed church, meaning that development at the western end of the site (either side of the Old Hall Farm drive) would have a detrimental impact on the setting of these designated heritage assets. This would leave the eastern end of the site as a potential Settlement Limit extension; however, this would not justify the hedgerow/habitat loss.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 24/10/2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4031SL
Site address	Land adjacent to no1 Station Road Alburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2014/0451 Erection of code level 6 dwelling, including an observatory (Para 55) Refused. Dismissed at Appeal 2016/0526 Detached 4 bedroomed house (Para 55) – Refused Dismissed at Appeal 2019/2381 Erection of bungalow - Withdrawn
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.2ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Settlement extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	2 Bungalows
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:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No

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:

Locally Designated Green Space	Millennium Garden Alburgh, Amenity Open Space - confirmed
--------------------------------	---

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		Potential access constraints existing hedge to site frontage. NCC Highways – Green, narrow carriageway, no footway.	Amber/green
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 		No village Shop Bus stop within 80m and is on the bus route for Anglian 84 Primary School is within 973m	

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

<p><i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○Village/ community hall ○Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Village Hall 1.36km</p> <p>Recreational ground/play area next to village hall 1.34km</p> <p>Public House 1.29km (A143)</p> <p>Pre-school at the primary school</p>	<p>Green</p>
<p>Utilities Capacity</p>		<p>Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed</p>	<p>Amber</p>
<p>Utilities Infrastructure</p>		<p>Promoter advises water, no mains sewage and electricity available to site.</p>	<p>Green</p>
<p>Better Broadband for Norfolk</p>		<p>The site is within an area already served by fibre technology</p>	<p>Green</p>
<p>Identified ORSTED Cable Route</p>		<p>Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location</p>	<p>Green</p>
<p>Contamination & ground stability</p>		<p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues</p> <p>SNC Environmental Services Land Quality, Green:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 <p>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.</p>	<p>Green</p>
<p>Flood Risk</p>		<p>Surface Water Flooding 1-1000 to the southwest in the road and to the boundary to the west but not on the site</p> <p>LLFA - Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage.</p>	<p>Green</p>

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	X
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 – Waveney Rural River Valley – majority of the site falls into this character area B4 - Waveney Tributary Farmland – northern part of the site falls into this character area.	
Overall Landscape Assessment		Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated. Sensitive landscape due to most of the site, particularly the frontage, being in the River Valley.	Amber
Townscape		The settlement is dispersed with different areas of character. This site is at the southern end of the village near the concentration of buildings at the junction of Low Road, Turnbeck Road and Station Road known as Piccadily Corner. The site is currently used as paddock/agricultural and lies slightly to the east of the junction on the north side behind an existing hedge. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.	Amber/Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity		Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology – Green, potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

<p>Historic Environment</p>		<p>To the west of the site there are four listed buildings close to the plot: Gayridge Farmhouse C17 grade II, Three Ways (now Willow Cottage), a small C17/C18 thatched cottage, Picadilly House (west of Picadilly Corner) C17 timber frame cottage, and (former) C17 Brock's Farmhouse to the north west Development could therefore have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB located to the west but could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	<p>Amber</p>
<p>Open Space</p>		<p>Development of the site would result in the Millennium Garden Alburgh, Amenity Open Space designation (not been implemented)</p>	<p>Amber</p>
<p>Transport and Roads</p>		<p>Potential impact on functioning of the road network may not be reasonably mitigated. Narrow carriage way and no footway</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, narrow carriageway, no footway.</p>	<p>Red</p>
<p>Neighbouring Land Uses</p>		<p>Agricultural/residential</p> <p>SNC Environmental Services Amenity, Green: - No issues observed.</p>	<p>Green</p>

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB' s.</p> <p>The site is detached from the main part of the village. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character, a feature of the River Valley. Therefore, the development would have a detrimental impact on townscape, which could not be reasonably mitigated.</p>	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Potential access constraints as there are existing hedge to site frontage.	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Paddock/agricultural grade 3	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Agricultural and residential	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedgerow to the southern boundary. Residential boundaries to the west and east.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Removal of hedgerow which would be subject to an assessment of importance under the Hedgerows Regulations	
<i>Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)</i>	Overhead line to the south (frontage of the site)	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Views into the site are limited due to existing residential development bounding the site to the west and east. Existing hedges screen the site from South. However, the development would be visible from the surrounding road network.	

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion <i>(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)</i>	Not adjacent to the development boundary, detached from the main part of the village. Well related to some services. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character, a feature of the River Valley. Therefore, the development would have a detrimental impact on townscape and the landscape which could not be reasonably mitigated, particularly as most of the site is within the River Valley.	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)
A5 – Waveney Rural River Valley		
Open Countryside		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
Availability and Achievability	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	X
	Within 5 years	
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	None	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	N/A for two bungalows	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability Not considered suitable due to potential adverse impacts on landscape, townscape and separation for the main part of the village

Site Visit Observations Detached from the main part of the village. Well related to some services. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character, a feature of the River Valley. Therefore, the development would have a detrimental impact on townscape and the landscape which could not be reasonably mitigated, particularly as most of the site is within the River Valley.

Local Plan Designations Within open countryside and river valley and not adjacent to the development boundary,

Availability Promoter has advised availability immediately

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Unreasonable – The site is promoted for a Settlement Limit extension in a part of the village with no existing Settlement Limit. The character of the area is of mixed development (small scale industry, agriculture and residential), but very much dispersed in pattern. The site is at the edge of the designated River Valley and in the vicinity of four listed properties; whilst these in themselves might not prevent development, creating a Settlement Limit in this location could encourage development that would seriously erode the character of the area. Previous applications on this site for an outstanding county house (under the NPPF) and a sustainable (then Code 6) home have both been dismissed at appeal within the past 6 years.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 24/11/2020