

# Barford, Marlingford, Colton & Wrampingham Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

## Contents

SN0416 .....	3
SN0424 .....	11
SN0425 .....	19
SN0474 .....	27
SN0475REVA .....	34
SN0475B .....	41
SN0552 .....	48
SN1013REV .....	56

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0416
<b>Site address</b>	Land south of Barford Church and north of Barnham Broom Road, Barford
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary b- unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Historic refusal for residential development
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	1.21 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension</b>	Both  (The site has been promoted for residential development with an area of open space south of the church – 8 dwellings has been suggested by the site promoter although the site is large enough to accommodate an allocation of 12 or more dwellings and could therefore be considered for either a SL extension or an allocation)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	Up to 30 dwellings at 25 dph  6dph at 8 dwellings
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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>Constrained access options from the church or off Barnham Broom Road</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – 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. Surrounding highway network is sub-standard and there is no safe walking route to school.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Distance to Barford Primary School 750 metres but with limited footway provision</p> <p>Bus route passes site</p> <p>Local employment in village 950km from site</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Barford village hall and recreation area 600 metres  Distance to The Cock public house (currently closed) 790 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	The promoter is unsure if mains water, sewerage and electricity are 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  <b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION</b> – Green	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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	
SN Landscape Character Area (Land Use Consultants 2001)		B6 Yare Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Although not in an identified river valley landscape the site is in a prominent elevated position. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Site would have poor relationship with existing pattern of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Sites to north in Yare valley	Amber

Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II* Church of St Botolph to north  <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Rural roads with no footways in close proximity  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – 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. Surrounding highway network is sub-standard and there is no safe walking route to school	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential, agricultural and place of worship	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Site forms important role in setting of church which development would affect greatly.	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access could be achieved off Barnham Broom Road though this would require speed limit restrictions to be extended as it is currently a rural road within the open countryside. Access by the church is highly constrained.	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural land, no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential properties to east, church to north and agricultural to south and west. No compatibility issues	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Site is largely level	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Sections of hedging and trees on southern boundary. Eastern boundary is domestic fences and evergreen hedging. Western boundary is undefined as part of same field	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Significant tree in north-eastern corner of site. Further large tree on southern boundary has sustained recent serious storm damage. Other potential habitat limited to small sections of hedging and trees.	
<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 evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Open views across site from Barnham Broom Road and permissive footpath that runs alongside it. Site is prominent within the landscape due to its elevated position.	

<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> ( <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 considered appropriate to allocate as development of this site would be detrimental to the wider landscape and to the setting of the church. Also has potential access and connectivity constraints.	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 ( <i>UNIFORM</i> )	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Conclusion</b>	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		
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown		
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		



<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	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? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Footway provision may be required; open space and/or landscaping to protect the setting of the Church	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 recent evidence of viability (a 2016 letter from an affordable housing provider was submitted at the time the site was originally promoted)	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Green/ open space suggested	

## Part 7 Conclusion

<b>CONCLUSION</b>
<p><b><i>Suitability</i></b></p> <p>The site is of a suitable size to be allocated although it has been promoted for a smaller number of dwellings (of a settlement limit extension scale) to include open space south of the Church. The site is removed from the existing settlement boundary and would not be a logical extension of the existing settlement limit. Constraints noted relating to the proximity to the designated heritage asset, as well as potential access constraints.</p> <p><b><i>Site Visit Observations</i></b></p> <p>The site is in a prominent location and development would have a significant impact on the local landscape, in particular on views to the church whose setting would be harmed, even if an area of open space is incorporated adjacent to the Church. Potential connectivity issues due to the lack of footways have also been identified.</p> <p><b><i>Local Plan Designations</i></b></p> <p>There are no conflicting designations however the site is removed from the development boundary.</p> <p><b><i>Availability</i></b></p> <p>Promoter states the site is available.</p>

***Achievability***

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

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is UNREASONABLE and is considered to be unsuitable as either an allocation or an extension to the existing settlement limit. Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed Church immediately to the north of the site. The inclusion of an area of open space to the south of the Church is not considered sufficient to overcome this impact and would reduce the developable area of the site. The site is removed from the existing settlement limit and has connectivity issues and is therefore also not considered to be suitable as a settlement limit extension.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 22 October 2020

**SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form**

**Part 1 Site Details**

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0424
<b>Site address</b>	Land south of Marlingford Road, Colton
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	No relevant planning history other than approval for the affordable dwellings which the site surrounds (2012/0639)
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.75 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension</b>	Allocation
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	The site has been promoted for 16 dwellings – 21dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

**Part 2 Absolute Constraints**

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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 for suitable access to site is severely constrained due to nature of local road network</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.</p>	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Distance to Barford Primary School 2.4km along mainly narrow country lanes</p> <p>Distance to bus stop in Barford or to north more than 1.8km</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Colton village hall and play area 810 metres  Distance to Norfolk Lurcher public house 1.2km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water supply and sewerage network capacity to be confirmed  AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter is unsure if mains water, sewerage and electricity are provided	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Information not available	Amber
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	Green
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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> )		A2 Yare / Tiffey Rural River Valley / G1 Easton Fringe Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Part of site is in a designated river valley. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Green	No estate type development in the settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green

Historic Environment	Amber	No heritage assets in close proximity  <b>NCC HES</b> – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is highly constrained with no footways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.	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>	Development of site would result in a form of character that does not relate well to the existing form and character of Colton	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access to the site is promoted from Marlingford Road, although it could also be achieved from Barford Road. Both are highly constrained with little potential for adequate improvements	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural land with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential uses along Marlingford Road. Other adjoining land is in agricultural use. No compatibility issues	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Site is largely level	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Southern and eastern boundary is undefined as part of larger field. No boundary treatment on western boundary with Barford Road.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Limited habitat due to lack of vegetation on the site other than recently planted trees / hedging on Marlingford Road	
<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 evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Open views across site from Barford Road to Marlingford Road	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> <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>	Site not considered suitable for allocation or inclusion within the settlement limit as it will introduce a form of development into an area that it is not characteristic and intrude into open countryside. The local road network is also highly constrained	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 ( <i>UNIFORM</i> )	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
River Valley		
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Site falls partly within River Valley 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		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	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>	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? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Local highway improvements would 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 recent evidence of viability (A supporting letter from an affordable housing provider was submitted in 2016)	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

#### ***Suitability***

The site is of a suitable size for a small allocation. Potential access constraints and local road network constraints have been identified but no other significant constraints have been identified.

#### ***Site Visit Observations***

The site is prominent in an open landscape, particularly on approach to the village from south. The existing character of the village is loose frontage development along the road, retaining a rural character. The existing road network is very constrained.

#### ***Local Plan Designations***

The site is outside and removed from the development boundary. The site is also partly 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 considered to be unsuitable for allocation and is therefore UNREASONABLE. It is located in a prominent location within the landscape and would have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of Colton, particularly when approaching from the south. The local road network is also noted to have considerable constraints which can not be overcome.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 22 October 2020

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0425
<b>Site address</b>	Land at Mill Road and Barford Road, Marlingford
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Historic refusals of individual dwellings
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.86 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension</b>	Settlement limit extension – five dwellings  (The site has been promoted for 5 dwellings only and as a SL extension although it would be large enough to accommodate a greater number of dwellings)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	5 dph at 5 dwellings
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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>Possibility of creating suitable access is severely constrained</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber.                      Access may be achievable but would require carriageway widening to 5.5m &amp; 2.0m wide footway at the site frontage, hedges and trees likely to require removal. 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

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  <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Red	Distance to Barford Primary School 2.3km, mainly along rural road with no footway	
		Distance to Marlingford village hall and cricket ground 220 metres  Marlingford Bell public house less than 100 metres	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water recycling centre capacity to be checked	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but not 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	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Significant parts of site are in Flood Zone 2	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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> )		A2 Yare / Tiffey Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is designated river valley. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Little existing development on southern side of Barford Road or northern side of Mill Road	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	County Wildlife Site to east, but intervening residential development	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed buildings on opposite side of Barford Road  <b>NCC HES</b> – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is highly constrained with no footways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Access may be achievable but would require carriageway widening to 5.5m & 2.0m wide footway at the site frontage, hedges and trees likely to require removal. 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.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and woodland	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Development would not relate well to the existing linear pattern of development along the southern side of Mill Road and northern side of Barford Road with open space in between the two roads. Furthermore, development would be likely to have an adverse impact on the setting of the listed building on the northern side of Barford Road	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	An access could potentially be achieved onto either road, albeit with the loss of some hedgerow.	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Meadow land, no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential properties on opposite sides of both roads with meadow land and woodland either side of the site in between the two roads. No compatibility issues.	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Site is largely level	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Trees and hedgerows along highway boundaries	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Meadow including grassland and access to water features could provide habitat along with hedgerows and trees	
<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 evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Views into site possible along both Mill Road and Barford Road but limited by hedging and trees	

<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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 recommended for allocation due to the site's separation from services, the adverse impact development would have in this location as well impact on nearby designated heritage assets.	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		
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	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		
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown		
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		



<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Highway works likely to be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Due to site constraints the site has been promoted for 5 dwellings – therefore below the affordable housing threshold	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

<b>CONCLUSION</b>
<p><b><i>Suitability</i></b></p> <p>Site is of a suitable size of a settlement limit extension or potentially a small allocation however large parts of the site are within Flood Zone 2. The site is poorly related to existing services and is within a sensitive river valley setting.</p> <p><b><i>Site Visit Observations</i></b></p> <p>An area of meadow land that forms part of the undeveloped sides of Mill Road and Barford Road and contributes to the setting of the listed building. The site potentially has ecological value which would be lost if developed. Access constraints have also been identified.</p> <p><b><i>Local Plan Designations</i></b></p> <p>The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation.</p> <p><b><i>Availability</i></b></p> <p>Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p><b><i>Achievability</i></b></p> <p>Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p>

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is UNREASONABLE as both an allocation and an extension to the existing settlement limit. Development of the site would conflict with the linear pattern of development in evidence, eroding the character of the settlement. The site relates poorly to the existing services, including the local school. The site is also within a sensitive River Valley setting and furthermore, access constraints to the site have also been identified.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 29 October 2020

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0474
<b>Site address</b>	Land west of Colton Road, Marlingford
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Various applications relating for former quarry use
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	2.15 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension</b>	Allocation for residential – numbers not specified, could be holiday accommodation or staff accommodation linked to Barnham Broom Golf Club
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	53 dwellings at 25dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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>Access options constrained by nature of local highway network</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Access achievable with removal of frontage hedges/trees to provide adequate visibility, along with the required c/w widening and frontage footway. 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.</p>	Amber

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  <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Distance to Barford Primary School 2km mainly along rural roads with no footways  Distance to bus service 640 metres	
		Distance to Marlingford village hall and cricket ground and Colton village hall and recreation area both 1.7km  Distance to Marlingford Bell public house 1.4km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water supply and water recycling centre likely to be needed to be upgraded	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		No planned upgrade to fibre technology	Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Previous use of site for mineral extraction	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Site contains several areas at risk of surface water flooding	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	X

SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		G1 Easton Fringe Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development will introduce urban development into an area of open landscape to its detriment. Some parts of site are in high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would be detached from main parts of settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Site is adjacent to ancient woodland	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Access achievable with removal of frontage hedges/trees to provide adequate visibility, along with the required c/w widening and frontage footway. 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.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential, agricultural and woodland	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Development would be detached development with no relationship to the existing main parts of the settlement	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access onto public highway would require the removal of extensive vegetation. Road is also highly constrained which NCC Highways note is not suitable for development	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Field, not clear if in agricultural use. Possible issues from former quarry use on part of site	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential properties to south. Agricultural land to north, east and west. Woodland to south-west. No compatibility issues	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Some level differences within site	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Belt of trees along highway boundary. Trees and hedging along other boundaries	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Potential habitat in trees and hedging. Also adjacent to ancient woodland with other habitat to south-west	
<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>	Some potential for contamination from previous mineral extraction use which would need to be investigated further.	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Views into site are limited due to boundary treatment, particularly from Colton Road	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> <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>	Site is remote from the main parts of the settlement and therefore would be harmful to the landscape and rural character of the area, as well suffering from poor access due to the restricted nature of the local highway 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 ( <i>UNIFORM</i> )	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	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		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately		
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	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>	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? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Carriageway widening and footway provision would 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

CONCLUSION
<p><b><i>Suitability</i></b></p> <p>Site could be reduced in size to be suitable for an allocation of 12 to 25 dwellings.</p> <p><b><i>Site Visit Observations</i></b></p> <p>Site is remote from the main parts of the settlement, accessed by narrow country lanes. Site is well screened.</p> <p><b><i>Local Plan Designations</i></b></p> <p>Outside and detached from any development boundary.</p> <p><b><i>Availability</i></b></p> <p>Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p><b><i>Achievability</i></b></p> <p>Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p><b>OVERALL CONCLUSION: Not suitable due to remote location of site and poor access</b></p> <p><b>Preferred Site:</b>  <b>Reasonable Alternative:</b>  <b>Rejected: Yes</b></p>

Date Completed: 2 December 2020

**SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form**

**Part 1 Site Details**

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0475REVA
<b>Site address</b>	Land east of Highhouse Farm Lane, Colton
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	No planning history
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.77 hectares (Option A)
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension</b>	Allocation  (The site has been promoted for 12 mainly affordable housing)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	15dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

**Part 2 Absolute Constraints**

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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>Constraints on achieving suitable access due to nature of road network</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. No access from the highway. 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. * Not specified if A or B on previous notes</p>	Red

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  <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Distance to Barford Primary School 3.3km along rural roads with no footways  No bus service within 1.8km	
		Distance to Colton village hall and play area 850 metres  Adjacent to Norfolk Lurcher public house	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewerage network (including the water recycling centre) infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Clarification required 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  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. Standard information required.	Green
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	X
		G1 Easton Fringe Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site contains high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would not reflect linear frontage development in village	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed buildings to west	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is heavily constrained with no footways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. No access from the highway. 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>	Development of this site would not relate well to the existing form and character of Colton	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access could be achieved onto Highhouse Farm Lane, however this is a very constrained rural lane	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural land, with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential to north and agricultural land to south, along with remainder of site (Option B) to east. Public house to north-east of site, however it is unlikely that the issues this raises would prevent development of the site	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Site is largely level	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Large trees on southern boundary. Hedging and trees on northern boundary. Belt of bushes and trees on highway boundary. Eastern boundary is undefined as part of larger field	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Potential habitat in vegetation on site boundaries	
<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 power line crosses western part of site running north-south	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Views into site are limited due to vegetation on highway boundary	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> <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>	Site is not recommended for either allocation or settlement limit extension given poor relationship with form and character of existing village, constrained road network and poor access to services	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 ( <i>UNIFORM</i> )	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	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		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately		
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	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>	Supporting form from promoter	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Highways 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?	Public open space and affordable housing above policy requirements	

### Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p><b>Suitability</b></p> <p>Site is of a suitable size to be allocated but is over 3km from the primary school. Highways issues and access constraints have been identified. Potential landscape issues resulting from possible loss of existing trees and hedgerows.</p> <p><b>Site Visit Observations</b></p> <p>The site is poorly connected and is remote from existing services; it is also in conflict with the existing linear form of development along Norwich Road. Highhouse Farm Lane is a narrow rural lane.</p> <p><b>Local Plan Designations</b></p> <p>Site is outside the development boundary, although is within relatively close proximity.</p> <p><b>Availability</b></p> <p>Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p><b>Achievability</b></p> <p>Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p><b>OVERALL CONCLUSION:</b> The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE and is not suitable for allocation. The benefits of an affordable housing led scheme are outweighed by the poor connectivity of the site, including its distance from the local primary school, as well as the impact development of the site would have on the existing form and character of the settlement. Significant highways network and access constraints have also been identified.</p> <p><b>Preferred Site:</b>  <b>Reasonable Alternative:</b>  <b>Rejected:</b> Yes</p>

Date Completed: 2 December 2020



## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0475B
<b>Site address</b>	Land east of Highhouse Farm Lane, Colton
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	No planning history
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.97 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension</b>	Allocation  (The site has been promoted for 12 mainly affordable housing)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	12 dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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>Constraints on achieving suitable access due to nature of road network and need to cross neighbouring land (option A)</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Does not appear to be accessible from the highway. 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. (site assumed adjacent to SN0475REVA)</p>	Red

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  <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Red	Distance to Barford Primary School 3.3km along rural roads with no footways  No bus service within 1.8km	
		Distance to Colton village hall and play area 850 metres  Adjacent to Norfolk Lurcher public house	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewerage network (including the water recycling centre) capacity to be confirmed  AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Clarification required 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  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. Standard information required.	Green
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Plateau Farmland		
		Valley Urban Fringe		
		Fringe Farmland	x	
		G1 Easton Fringe Farmland		
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site contains high grade agricultural land		Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would not reflect linear frontage development in village		Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity		Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed buildings to west		Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space		Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is heavily constrained with no footways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> - Does not appear to be accessible from the highway. 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. (site assumed adjacent to SN0475REVA)		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>	Development of this site would not relate well to the existing form and character of Colton and would also have long access from the road	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access could be achieved onto Highhouse Farm Lane across option A, however this is a very constrained rural lane	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural land, with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential to north and agricultural land to south. Public house to north-east of site, however it is unlikely that the issues this raises would prevent development of the site	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Site is largely level	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Large trees on southern boundary. Hedging and trees on northern boundary. Western boundary is undefined as part of larger field	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Potential habitat in vegetation on site boundaries	
<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 power line crosses western part of site running north-south	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Views into site are limited due to vegetation on highway boundary	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> <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>	Site is not recommended for either allocation or settlement limit extension given poor relationship with form and character of existing village, constrained road network and poor access to services	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 ( <i>UNIFORM</i> )	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	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		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately		
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	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>	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 improvement works 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?	Public open space and affordable housing above policy requirements	

## Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p><b>Suitability</b></p> <p>Site is of a suitable size to be allocated but over 3km from school. Potential severe access and highway network constraints identified. The site does not appear to relate well to the existing form of development within Colton.</p> <p><b>Site Visit Observations</b></p> <p>The site is poorly connected and is remote from existing services; it is also in conflict with the existing linear form of development along Norwich Road. Highhouse Farm Lane is a narrow rural lane. Access to the site would need to be across adjacent land (option A).</p> <p><b>Local Plan Designations</b></p> <p>Site outside but adjacent to the development boundary.</p> <p><b>Availability</b></p> <p>Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p><b>Achievability</b></p> <p>Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p><b>OVERALL CONCLUSION:</b> The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE and is not suitable for inclusion as an allocation. The site relates poorly to the existing services, including the primary school, and would have a poor relationship with the existing form and character of the settlement. Significant access and highway network constraints have also been identified and are considered to be further barriers to the development of this site.</p> <p><b>Preferred Site:</b>  <b>Reasonable Alternative:</b>  <b>Rejected:</b> Yes</p>

Date Completed: 2 December 2020

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0552
<b>Site address</b>	Land off Watton Road, Barford
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Historic refusals for residential development to south of B1108
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	36.54 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension</b>	Allocation  (The site has been promoted for a 29ha country park and 150 dwellings with the developable area approximately 7.54 ha)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	19dph (based upon the above developable area)
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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>Constraints on where access can be delivered</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Subject to being able to provide a junction with 2.4 x 120m visibility in both direction, which may require third party land, a safe pedestrian crossing on the B1108, assessment of the village speed limit and localised footway improvements where possible to provide a 2.0m footway, development likely to be considered acceptable.</p>	Amber
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	Amber	<p>Distance to Barford Primary School between 500 metres and 1km from site</p> <p>Bus service runs past site along B1108</p> <p>Local employment on opposite side of B1108 to southern part of site</p>	

<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Barford village hall and recreation area between 300 metres and 800 metres  The Cock public house (currently closed) is adjacent to the site	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure 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	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  <b>NCC MINERALS &amp; WASTE</b> – This site is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site goes 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.  <b>NATIONAL GRID</b> – Green. Note this site would be affected by the Transmission Line Route ‘Norwich Main – Walpole 1’ [no objection is raised]  <b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION</b> – Green.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface and fluvial flood risk on large areas of southern part of site plus along B1108 on northern part of site	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>

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> )		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland		
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Site is within identified river valley. No loss of high grade agricultural land.</p> <p><b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER</b> – This site forms a natural corridor and ecological constraints may be problematic. There are long views back across the site.</p>	Amber	
Townscape	Amber	Development of either part of the site would not relate directly to the existing pattern of development	Amber	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Site to east	Amber	
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Site surrounds Grade II listed building on B1108. Also affects setting of non-designated heritage assets such as the Cock public house</p> <p><b>NCC HES</b> – Amber</p>	Amber	
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green	
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Cock Lane is a narrow constrained lane whilst there is a lack of footways along the B1108</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Subject to being able to provide a junction with 2.4 x 120m visibility in both direction, which may require third party land, a safe pedestrian crossing on the B1108, assessment of the village speed limit and localised footway improvements where possible to provide a 2.0m footway, development likely to be considered acceptable.</p>	Amber	

Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Largely 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>	Potential adverse impact on designated and non-designated heritage assets depending on which part of the site is developed. However, whether developing the northern part of the site or the southern section it is detached from the main part of the settlement, particularly when considering that the part of the site that best relates to the village is the area most at risk of flooding.	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Potential for access varies on which part of site is to be developed, however highways have indicated that access could be achievable but is likely to require improvements to pedestrian facilities	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Largely agricultural use with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Two sets of residential properties surrounded by site. Public house (currently closed) and commercial units to north of site that would need to be taken into account in any residential scheme. Agricultural land to south and west, meadow land around River Tiffey to east.	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Southern part of site largely level, northern part of site rising out of valley floor	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Boundaries of northern part of site with B1108 and Cock Lane are open. Hedging on parts of southern part site that bound B1108. South-western boundary of southern part of site undefined as forms part of large field	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Trees and hedging on boundaries provide habitat. Close to river and some ponds	

<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)	Overheard power lines on southern part of site	
<i>Description of the views</i> (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across northern part of site both from B1108 and Cock Street. Development on northern part of site would be prominent in river valley landscape. Some views possible from Wramplingham across the river valley to the south.	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> ( <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 suitable for development. Much of the site is detached from the main settlement and its development would have a considerable landscape impact. Those areas of the site that have the strongest relationship to the existing village are those that are at greatest risk of flooding.	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 ( <i>UNIFORM</i> )	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
River Valley		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Site falls within River Valley 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		
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	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	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>	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? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Various highways improvements would be required . Flood issues would also required resolution/ mitigation.	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?	Major new public park proposed (28.94 hectares)	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

#### ***Suitability***

As promoted the site is of an excessive size however it could be reduced to a size suitable for an allocation of 25 dwellings. Significant areas of flood risk have been identified across the site, as well as nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets. There is a County Wildlife Site to the east of the site. Whilst highway constraints have been identified it may be possible to overcome these with various agreed highway works.

#### ***Site Visit Observations***

This is a large site comprising of a number of elements, however it is mainly divided between a large open field to north of B1108 and parts of fields around existing clusters of buildings to the south of B1108. Parts of the site are quite prominent in views and development of these areas would have a potential adverse impact on the designated River Valley landscape. Development of the site would not result in a strong relationship with the main existing parts of the village.

#### ***Local Plan Designations***

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 considered to be UNREASONABLE for allocation, either as promoted or at a reduced scale to meet the objectives of the Plan. As promoted the site is excessive in scale and would have a significant adverse impact on the wider landscape. A site of reduced size would be more appropriate however it would continue to have an adverse landscape impact and due to the identified flood risk constraints on those parts of the site closest to the existing settlement new development would have a poor relationship with the main village. It may be possible to overcome the identified highway concerns through various highway mitigation measures.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 29 October 2020

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN1013REV
<b>Site address</b>	Land between Church Lane and Back Lane, Barford
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated (land to the north of the site comprises existing allocation BAR1)
<b>Planning History</b>	Refused planning application on allocation (2019/0556) immediately to the north
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	2 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension</b>	Allocation  (The site has been promoted for 60 dwellings)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	30 dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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>Constrained nature of road makes access difficult to achieve. Access to the site would be via Back Lane or through the existing allocation on Church Lane which has proved to be problematic in highways terms.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Access would require removal of frontage trees &amp; hedges, along with provision of frontage carriageway widening &amp; footway. No safe walking route to school/village facilities.</p>	Amber
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	Amber	<p>Distance to Barford Primary School 330 metres via existing allocation – no footway on Church Lane</p> <p>Bus service passes site</p> <p>Local employment 550 metres from site</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Barford village hall and recreation area 170 metres  Distance to The Cock public house (currently closed) 460 metres	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  <b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION</b> - Green	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Surface water flood risk along Church Lane  <b>LLFA</b> – Green	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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> )		A2 Yare / Tiffey Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would be in designated River Valley landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Would introduce estate development into area of village where this not characteristic	Amber

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets in close proximity  <b>NCC HES</b> – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is very constrained with no footways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Access would require removal of frontage trees & hedges, along with provision of frontage carriageway widening & footway. No safe walking route to school/village facilities.	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>	Would introduce estate development into a part of the village that has a rural loose pattern of development and is positioned away from the main part of the settlement. A site of reduced scale would have a similar impact.	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Significant constraints on Church Lane have prevented delivery of the existing allocation. New evidence has been submitted which would need to be considered by the Highway Authority if access were to be considered via Church Lane. Access via Back Lane also appears to be constrained due to the narrow lane.	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Existing greenfield site that may have formerly been part of land associated with The Hall	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential properties on northern side of Church Lane. Large grounds of The Hall to the east. Farm to the west and agricultural land on opposite side of Back Lane to the south. Existing allocation BAR1 immediately to the north. Development should be achievable without compatibility issues.	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Road lower than site	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Boundaries are all well vegetated with hedging and trees	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Trees within site along with vegetation on the boundaries provide habitat	
<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 evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on or adjacent to 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 of the site are contained by vegetation on highway boundaries	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> <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>	The site is not suitable for allocation due to access issues, as well as estate development of the scale proposed (or at a reduced scale) being out of character with this part of the village	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).

<b>Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
River Valley		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Site falls within River Valley designation	Amber

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership		
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	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	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>	Supporting form from promoter. Known highway constraint preventing delivery of current allocation adjacent to the site. The promoter of the site has indicated access would be achievable via BAR1.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Footway provision would be required, although its deliverability is questionable.	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 and has provided viability evidence but this would need updating.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

#### ***Suitability***

The site could be reduced in size to be suitable for an allocation of between 12 to 25 dwellings however the site is adjacent to existing allocation BAR1 which has known access constraints. Access via Back Lane would also be subject to the constraints of the existing road network.

#### ***Site Visit Observations***

The site is in a more rural area of village and has well vegetated boundaries. The existing development pattern is loose in form. Access to the site via Church Lane would be constrained due to the levels difference and Back Lane is also a narrow road.

#### ***Local Plan Designations***

The site is adjacent to the existing allocation. It is also within a designated River Valley.

#### ***Availability***

Promoter states the site is available.

#### ***Achievability***

Development of the site is achievable, if a suitable access could be provided.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE site for allocation. Principle access is proposed via the existing allocation, BAR1, which has known access constraints. Furthermore, even at a reduced scale/ site size development in this location would have an adverse impact on the existing loose pattern form of development that characterises this part of the village.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 29 October 2020