

Barnham Broom, Kimberley, Carlton  
Forhoe, Runhall & Brandon Parva  
Village Cluster  
Site Assessment Forms

## Contents

SN0018SL .....	3
SN0055 .....	12
SN0174 .....	20
SN0196 .....	29
SN0324 .....	39
SN0476REV .....	47
SN2110 .....	55
SN4051 .....	63
SN4078 .....	72

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

**Part 1 Site Details**

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0018SL
<b>Site address</b>	Land north of Norwich Road, adj 101.
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	None, however the wider field/paddock was within the Settlement Limit in the 2003 Local Plan.
<b>Planning History</b>	2015/2827, two dwellings refused – outside settlement boundary, and erosion of rural character.
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.18ha
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension</b>	SL Extension
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	Promoted for 2 dwellings at 11/ha.
<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	Green	<p>Long, open frontage to Norwich Road (although on the inside of a bend), with footway running to site frontage.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, subject to widening frontage carriageway to 5.5m and providing a 2.0m footway to connect with existing provision to west.</p>	Green

		<b>NCC Highways meeting</b> – sites at the eastern end of the village are well connected by footways.	
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>	Green	Distance to Barnham Broom Primary School 400 metres along Norwich Road (footway for almost entire length)  Distance to bus stop 400 metres  Distance to shop / post office 970 metres	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Distance to Barnham Broom sports pavilion and recreation area 200 metres  Distance to The Bell Inn public house 980 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Capacity TBC  AW advise sewers crossing the site	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified as effecting the delivery of the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Greenfield site with no known issues.  <b>SNC Env Services:</b>  Land Quality - Having regard to the past use of the site along with the	Green

		size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application.	
Flood Risk	Green	Surface water flood risk 1:1000 year on Norwich Road immediately outside the site, but not within the site itself.	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>		Yare Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	No designated landscapes effected. However the site is quite open, with views across to fields to the north, so will impact on the character of the area.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Would be a continuation of the modern frontage development on this side of Norwich Road.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designated sites in close proximity, and the part of the site	Green

		proposed for development has no immediate features.	
Historic Environment	Green	Non designated heritage assets to the south east	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Direct access to Norwich Road, one of the main roads serving the village and local bus route.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, subject to widening frontage carriageway to 5.5m and providing a 2.0m footway to connect with existing provision to west.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways meeting</b> – sites at the eastern end of the village are well connected by footways.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Residential to the west, agricultural to the remaining boundaries. Telephone exchange in the far eastern corner of the site.</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services:</b></p> <p>Amenity - The site is adjacent to a Telephone Exchange which can be a source of noise and should be considered as part of any application.</p>	Amber

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
-------------------------	----------	----------------------

<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Impact on setting of non-designated heritage assets by removing their rural setting.	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Safe access from Norwich Road would appear possible, although the site is on the inside of a slight bend	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Paddock.	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential and agricultural, no obvious issues.	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Level site.	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Low boundary to the road frontage and hedging to the adjoining property. The proposed site doesn't have a boundary as such, but the wider field has a number of mature trees on the boundary.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	The site itself has limited features.	
<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>	Greenfield site with no obvious concerns.	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Views across the site to the wider countryside beyond, giving the site amore rural feel than if it was more enclosed.	
<b>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)</b>	A small settlement limit extension could continue the frontage development on this side of Norwich Road. The main concern would the impact on the rural character of the area and the setting on the non-	Amber



	designated heritage asset to the south east.	
--	--	--

### 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)
Open Countryside		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Adjacent to the existing Development Boundary	Green

### Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>		
	Immediately	

When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Within 5 years		
	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>		
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>		
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?		
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?		

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

#### **Suitability**

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

#### **Site Visit Observations**

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

#### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside, but adjacent to the existing Development Limit

#### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

#### **Achievability**

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

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

**Preferred Site:** Yes

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: January 2021

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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0055
<b>Site address</b>	Land east of Spur Road and south of Norwich Road, Barnham Broom
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	No relevant planning history
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	1.95 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension</b>	Allocation – numbers not specified
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	Assumed 25/ha
<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 existing hedgerows</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> - Amber - Vehicular access at Norwich Road &amp; pedestrian access at Spur Road. Footway to be provided at Norwich Rd frontage &amp; to tie in with ex facility to west of site. New f/w to be provided at Spur Road between site and Norwich Road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways meeting</b> – sites at the eastern end of the village are well connected by footways and have potential, SN0055 would appear to perform the best in highways terms.</p>	Amber

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> <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Barnham Broom Primary School 400 metres along Norwich Road (footway for almost entire length)  Distance to bus stop 400 metres  Distance to shop / post office 970 metres	
		Distance to Barnham Broom sports pavilion and recreation area 200 metres  Distance to The Bell Inn public house 980 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	AW advise sewers crossing the site	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues  <b>SNC Env Services</b> Land Quality - Having regard to the size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Some identified surface water risk in north of site and on highway	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
		Rural River Valley	

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> )		B6 Yare Tributary Farmland		
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Would result in intrusion into open countryside.</p> <p>Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land</p> <p><b>Landscape meeting</b> – significant hedgerows that would need to be assessed in terms of the hedgerow regulations. Significant oak tree on site.</p>		Amber
Townscape	Red	Would introduce estate development into area of village which is not characteristic		Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity		Green
Historic Environment	Red	<p>Non designated heritage assets to east</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>		Amber
Open Space	Amber	No loss of public open space		Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local road network is rural in character and constrained</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> - Amber - Vehicular access at Norwich Road &amp; pedestrian access at Spur Road. Footway to be provided at Norwich Rd frontage &amp; to tie in with ex facility to west of site. New f/w to be provided at Spur Road between site and Norwich Road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways meeting</b> – sites at the eastern end of the village are well connected by footways and have potential, SN0055 would appear to perform the best in highways terms.</p>		Amber

Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential  <b>SNC Env Services</b> Amenity - - No issues observed.	Green
------------------------	-------	--	-------

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Impact on setting of non-designated heritage assets by removing their rural setting. Would introduce estate development into part of the village where this is not characteristic	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access should be achievable from either Norwich Road or Spur Road but in either case is likely to require removal of sections hedgerow. Works to extend footway to site are also likely to be required	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural land, 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>	Residential to west, agricultural land to north and south. No compatibility issues	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Site is level	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedges on boundaries with both Norwich Road and Spur Road, with some significant trees. Some hedging and trees along southern boundary	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Habitat in trees and hedges on boundaries, ponds on land to east.	
<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>	Overheard power line crosses site	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Some views across site from public highway, particularly Norwich Road where field access is but generally limited by hedgerow.	



<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 suitable for allocation due to adverse impact on form and character of settlement and on setting of non-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 ( <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)	Not currently marketed.		
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		Green

<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 to link to footway along Norwich Road 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?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

#### ***Suitability***

Site could be of a suitable size to be allocated if reduced. The site is well located in terms of access to services and facilities, although some enhancements to footway provision would probably be necessary. The eastern end of the village has some small cul-de-sacs (Lincoln's Field and Chapel Close), but no larger estate scale development; as such, a smaller allocation (12-15 units) may be more in keeping.

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

On eastern fringe of village in a part of the settlement where there is no estate development. Also adjacent to non-designated heritage assets whose rural, open setting would be lost by development of the site.

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

Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

#### ***Availability***

Promoter states the site is available.

#### ***Achievability***

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

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** Reasonable - The site is well located in terms of access to services and facilities in Barnham Broom, although improvements to footways may be necessary. The site is rural in character, with frontage hedges, providing the setting to non-designated heritage assets; consequently, estate scale development is unlikely to be appropriate. However, the site could be considered suitable for a small-scale allocation of up to 25 units, potentially with some units fronting both Norwich Road and Spur Road

#### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 15 October 2020

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

**Part 1 Site Details**

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0174
<b>Site address</b>	Land off Bell Road, Barnham Broom
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	No planning history
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	2 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension</b>	Allocation – up to 50 dwellings
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	Up to 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	Red	<p>Access to the site is highly constrained but could be potentially achieved via the recently completed Bankside Way, although submission shows an access to the south west of Bankside Way</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> - Amber - Possible access from BARN 1 (Bankside Way). However no further development off Bell Road until junction with Mill Road / Norwich Road upgraded due to substandard visibility, which will need third party land to resolve.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - The road through the recently completed BARN1 allocation is not adopted to the site boundary, therefore there is likely to a ransom strip if SN0174 is accessed that way. Any access to the south west of BARN1, may have visibility splay issues to the south, over third party land, requiring removal of part of the bank.</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 Barnham Broom Primary School 1km with footways  Distance to bus service 480 metres  Distance to shop / post office 480 metres	
		Distance to Barnham Broom sports pavilion and recreation area 1.2km  Distance to The Bell Inn public house 410 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	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>SNC Env Services</b> - 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	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>
		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x

SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Tributary Farmland with Parkland		
		Settled Plateau Farmland		
		Plateau Farmland		
		Valley Urban Fringe		
		Fringe Farmland		
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B6 Yare Tributary Farmland		
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Potential impact on views across valley.</p> <p>Potential loss of high grade agricultural land</p> <p><b>Landscape meeting</b> - potential for a significant landscape impact arising from the allocation of this site as it is located on the edge of the Yare Valley.</p>	Amber	
Townscape	Amber	<p>Development did not relate well to existing settlement prior to development of allocation</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage</b> - may feel slightly disconnected from the rest of the village. If they can only access through the recently developed allocated site to the east that is relatively poor in terms of any new development feeling connected to the village.</p>	Amber	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green	
Historic Environment	Red	<p>Grade II listed Mill House to north</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage</b> - Setting of Mill House will be affected to the west – but impact on setting not of great significance and may be possible to be mitigated by additional landscaping.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber	

Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	<p>Access is potentially now achievable through development of allocation</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> - Red - Possible access from BARN 1. However no further development off Bell Road until junction with Mill Road / Norwich Road upgraded due to substandard visibility, which will need third party land to resolve.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - The road through the recently completed BARN1 allocation is not adopted to the site boundary, therefore there is likely to a ransom strip if SN0174 is accessed that way. Any access to the south west of BARN1, may have visibility splay issues to the south, over third party land, requiring removal of part of the bank.</p>	<b>Red</b>
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	<p>Agricultural and residential</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services:</b> Amenity - 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>	Development of eastern part of site could be acceptable in townscape terms if access can be achieved through new development. However, land descends into river valley to west where development would relate less well to existing development along Bell Road as well as having an adverse impact on the setting of the listed Mill House	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access appears to be achievable through the new development however this would need to be confirmed	
<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>	Agricultural land to north and south and remainder of field to west. Recently completed residential development to east. No compatibility issues	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Site is largely level in eastern part of site but falls away to the west into the valley	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Largely open boundary to the south. Hedge along northern boundary	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Potential habitat in hedging	
<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>	Overheard power line on northern boundary	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	View into site from access road in new development, otherwise views of site are fairly limited although there some potential longer distance views from Runhall Road across the valley	

<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>	Eastern half could be acceptable if access can be connected to Bankside Way in new development. Could be allocated with eastern half of site SN0196.	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 <i>(UNIFORM)</i>	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside		
<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>	Not currently marketed.	
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. Stated that there is legal right to connect to the highway through Bankside Way, and to utilities, but Bankside Way is not currently adopted highway to the site boundary. 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>	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

#### ***Suitability***

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated, subject to access being achieved via Bankside Way (which is not currently adopted to the site boundary). Site is reasonably located in terms of access to local services and facilities. However off-site highways works would be needed to improve visibility at the Bell Road/Norwich Road/ Mill Road junction. Landscape/visual impact on the Yare Valley increases to the west.

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

Western part of site not suitable for allocation due to impact on listed building and the character of the river valley even if not a specified river valley designation. However eastern half could relate well to existing development and could be allocated with eastern half of site SN0196 to north.

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

Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

#### ***Availability***

Promoter states the site is available.

#### ***Achievability***

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

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** Reasonable - The site is located with reasonable access to services and facilities and is in itself relatively unconstrained, subject to access from the recently completed Bankside Way development. However, the western part of the site would be more intrusive in the Yare Valley, be more problematic in terms of built form/townscape and encroach more on the nearby listed property. The most significant constraint is the need to improve the junction of Bell Road with Mill Road and Norwich Road, which requires third party land.

#### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes (eastern part of the site only)

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 15 October 2020

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

**Part 1 Site Details**

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0196
<b>Site address</b>	Land to the west of Mill View, Barnham Broom
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	Historic refusal for two dwellings on site
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	2 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension</b>	Allocation – up to 50 dwellings
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	Up to 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	Red	<p>Access to the site is unlikely to be achievable, unless through site SN0174 to the south</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> - Amber - Possible access from BARN 1 or via SN0174. However no further development off Bell Road until junction with Mill Road / Norwich Road upgraded due to substandard visibility, which will need third party land to resolve.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> – The site would need to be accessed via site SN0174. The road through the recently completed BARN1 allocation is not adopted to the site boundary SN0174, therefore there is likely to a ransom strip. Any access to the south west of BARN1, may have visibility splay issues to the south, over third party land, requiring removal of part of the bank.</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> <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Distance to Barnham Broom Primary School 950 metres with footways</p> <p>Distance to bus stops 350 metre</p> <p>Distance to shop / post office 350 metres</p>	
		<p>Distance to Barnham Broom sports pavilion and recreation area 1.1 km</p> <p>Distance to The Bell Inn public house 260 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	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	<p>No known contamination or ground stability issues</p> <p><b>NCC Minerals &amp; Waste</b> - Sites over 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services:</b> Land Quality - Having regard to the history of the site along with its size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application.</p>	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>		B6 Yare Tributary Farmland	



Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Potential impact on views across valley. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land</p> <p><b>Landscape meeting</b> - potential for a significant landscape impact arising from the allocation of this site as it is located on the edge of the Yare Valley. Accessing the site from SN0174 would also create an unfortunate breach of an existing significant hedgerow between the two sites.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Red	<p>Development of the site would not relate well to existing development in the village</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage</b> - may feel slightly disconnected from the rest of the village. If they can only access through the developed existing allocated site to the east that is relatively poor in terms of any new development feeling connected to the village.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Red	<p>Grade II listed Mill House to east</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage</b> - Setting of Mill House will be affected to the west – but impact on setting not of great significance and may be possible to be mitigated by additional landscaping.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber

Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	<p>No suitable road access to site unless access can be achieved through site SN0174</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> - Red - Possible access from BARN 1 or via SN0174. However no further development off Bell Road until junction with Mill Road / Norwich Road upgraded due to substandard visibility, which will need third party land to resolve.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> – The site would need to be accessed via site SN0174. The road through the recently completed BARN1 allocation is not adopted to the site boundary SN0174, therefore there is likely to a ransom strip. Any access to the south west of BARN1, may have visibility splay issues to the south, over third party land, requiring removal of part of the bank.</p>	<b>Red</b>
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	<p>Agricultural and residential</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services:</b> Amenity - 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>	Potential impact on listed building to west, particularly if entire site were to be developed. Development of site would only be acceptable if it could tie in with development of site SN0174 to the south which in turn would need confirmation of access through recently developed allocation	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access to the site is highly constrained. Possible option could be through site SN0174 to the south	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural use, 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>	Agricultural to south, residential to west, north and east. No compatibility issues	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Descends to west	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedge on southern boundary	
<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 habitat in hedging on boundaries. River not far to the west of the site.	
<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 on southern boundary	
<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 very limited from public viewpoints	
<b>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)</b>	Eastern half could be acceptable if access were achievable. This could be achieved through allocation with site SN0174 to south if access to that site can be achieved from Bankside Way in new development.	Amber

## Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations ( <i>UNIFORM</i> )	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside		
<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>	Submission is linked to the submission for site SN0174 to the south, with the indicated intention that this site be phased after SN0174.		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately		
	Within 5 years		
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years	Yes	Amber
	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)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green

<i>information to be included as appropriate)</i>		
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p><b><i>Suitability</i></b></p> <p>Site is of a suitable size to be allocated, subject to access being achieved through the adjoining submitted site (SN0174) via Bankside Way (which is not currently adopted to the site boundary of SN0174). Site is reasonably located in terms of access to local services and facilities. However off-site highways works would be needed to improve visibility at the Bell Road/Norwich Road/Mill Road junction. Landscape/visual impact on the Yare Valley increases to the west.</p> <p><b><i>Site Visit Observations</i></b></p> <p>Western part of site not suitable for allocation due to impact on listed building and the character of the river valley even if not a specified river valley designation. However eastern half could relate well to existing development. This would need to be allocated with site SN0174 to south to achieve access, which in turn is dependent on access being achieved from Bankside Way.</p> <p><b><i>Local Plan Designations</i></b></p> <p>Outside but adjacent to 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:</b> Reasonable - The site is located with reasonable access to services and facilities and is in itself relatively unconstrained, subject to access through the adjoining submitted site (SN0174) and via the recently completed Bankside Way development. However, the western part of the site would be more intrusive in the Yare Valley, be more problematic in terms of built</p>

form/townscape and encroach more on the nearby listed property. Development of this site would also require breaching the hedge between this site and SN0174. The most significant constraint is the need to improve the junction of Bell Road with Mill Road and Norwich Road, which requires third party land.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes (eastern part of the site only, in conjunction with the eastern part of SN0174)

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 15 October 2020

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

**Part 1 Site Details**

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0324
<b>Site address</b>	Land south west of Dades Farm, Norwich Road, Barnham Broom
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	No relevant planning history
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.85 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension</b>	Allocation – approx. 20 dwellings
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	24 dwellings/ha as promoted.
<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	Access would be onto rural road  <b>NCC Highways</b> - Amber - The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road width and lack of footpath provision and would not be acceptable in isolation. No safe walking route to school can be provided without third party land.	Amber
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	Distance to Barnham Broom Primary School 470 metres  Distance to bus stop 470 metres  Distance to shop / post office 1km	



Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Barnham Broom sports pavilion and recreation area 450 metres  Distance to The Bell Inn public house 1.1km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	AW advise sewers crossing the site Capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues  <b>SNC Env Services:</b> Land Quality - Having regard to the size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	identified surface water flood risk on 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> )		B6 Yare Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site potentially intrusive into open countryside.  Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land	Amber

Townscape	Red	Removed from pattern of development in main part of settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Red	Non designated heritage assets to south of site  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Amber	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Rural road with no footway  <b>NCC Highways</b> - Red - The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road width and lack of footpath provision and would not be acceptable in isolation. No safe walking route to school can be provided without third party land.	<b>Red</b>
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential  <b>SNC Env Services</b> Amenity - The site is adjacent to a Telephone Exchange which can be a source of noise and should be considered as part of any application.	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 have significant impact on non-designated heritage assets. However development of the site would be slightly detached from the main area of settlement on the village with any estate development out of character of the nearest part of the village	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Rural road but access could be possible although removal of hedge would be required. Extension of footway from village likely to be required	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural land, 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>	Land to north is remainder of large agricultural field. Primarily agricultural land on other boundaries but some residential to south	
<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>	Hedge along boundary with Norwich Road. Northern boundary is undefined as part of same field. Young trees along western boundary.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Some significant trees on boundaries, along with hedgerows. Some ponds on land on opposite side of road to south	
<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>	Site visible from most of highway boundary as hedgerow is currently not very high. Long views across site from south-east corner.	

<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 as detached from existing village with significant harm to rural character of area	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)
Open Countryside		
<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 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>	Footway likely to be required to connect to footway in village	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

#### ***Suitability***

Site is of suitable size to be allocated and is relatively unconstrained, although it is considered to be best and most versatile agricultural land and there are elements of surface water flood risk. The main concerns with the site relate to the form of development, which would create a detached group of dwellings poorly related to the rest of the village, and also the highways constraints.

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

Site is slightly detached from main part of settlement and in a rural, open context that development would have a significant adverse impact on.

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

Site is outside and detached from development boundary.

#### ***Availability***

Promoter states the site is available.

#### ***Achievability***

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

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** Unreasonable - Whilst the site itself has few constraints and is within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities, improved access would require footways to link to those further west along Norwich Road. Development would currently be detached from the main area of the village, and even if the intervening sites (which have been promoted for the Village Cluster Plan) were supported, development of this site would still be harmful to the open character of the area and the rural setting of Barnham Broom.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 15 October 2020

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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0476REV
<b>Site address</b>	Land east of Hingham Road and north of Barnham Broom Golf Club (The site lies within the clusters of both Barnham Broom and Barford)
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Part of site has current planning application for solar array (2020/1316)
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	17.8 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension</b>	Allocation  (The site has been promoted for residential use without numbers being specified but could include holiday accommodation, retirement living for over-55s or staff accommodation linked to Barnham Broom golf club)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	In excess of 400 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>Access options restricted due to nature of local road network</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Mature trees create visibility constraints at Honingham Road, access is achievable but would require significant highway improvement scheme. 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	Amber	Distance to Barnham Broom Primary School 2.5km, largely without footways (nearer than Barford Primary School)  Distance to bus service 2.2km  Distance to shop / post office 2.2km  Local employment at Barnham Broom Golf Club and Hotel	
		Distance to Barnham Broom village hall and recreation area 2.5km  Distance to The Bell public house 2.5km	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water supply would need to be upgraded and sewerage network (including water recycling centre) capacity would need to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some areas of site have identified surface water flood risk	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	X
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	

SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Fringe Farmland	
		A2 Yare / Tiffey Rural River Valley B6 Yare Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Large parts of site are designated river valley. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would be detached from main parts of settlement, either linked to Barford or Barnham Broom	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed church some way to east of site	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Mature trees create visibility constraints at Honingham Road, access is achievable but would require significant highway improvement scheme. 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 golf course	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 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 trees / hedgerows. Colton Road is also highly constrained which NCC Highways note is not suitable for development	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Mainly agricultural or equestrian, 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>	Agricultural land or woodland on most boundaries. Golf course to south on opposite side of Colton Road. No compatibility issues	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Site is on valley side so generally descends from north to south, but also with some undulation from east to west	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Some hedging and trees on boundaries	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundaries and also in adjacent woodland, plus from watercourses in valley floor	
<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 across site along Colton Road and also from Honnigham Road. Some longer views of parts of the site are possible from 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>	The site is remote from the main parts of the settlement and therefore would be harmful to the landscape and rural character of the area. It would also suffer 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)
River Valley		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Site is partly 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? <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)	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 evidence of viability however it is noted that most recently the site was promoted for a mix of retirement living for the over-55's and holiday homes, with limited market housing on the site.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

### Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p><b>Suitability</b></p> <p>The site could be reduced in size to be suitable for an allocation of 12 to 25 dwellings but due to its separation it does not relate well to the existing settlement. The site is poorly connected to the existing settlements in either the Barford or Barnham Broom clusters.</p> <p><b>Site Visit Observations</b></p> <p>The site is remote from the main parts of the settlement, accessed by a narrow country lane. The site is visible in a number of public views and development would be harmful to the river valley landscape.</p> <p><b>Local Plan Designations</b></p> <p>The site is partly within the river valley landscape designation.</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 an UNREASONABLE site for allocation. The site has a poor relationship to the existing settlements (Barnham Broom/Marlingford/Colton/Barford) and is a considerable distance from the existing services/facilities. Even at a reduced scale, development in this location would have an adverse impact on the landscape, including the River Valley, and highways constraints result in further issues that would hinder the development. Proposals for accommodation specifically tied to the existing commercial use at Barnham Broom</p>

Golf Club/Spa (e.g. holiday and/or staff accommodation), plus the expansion of the recreational facilities themselves could be made and assessed under current planning policies.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 2 December 2020

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

**Part 1 Site Details**

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN2110
<b>Site address</b>	Land south of Norwich Road, Barnham Broom
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	No relevant planning history
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.4 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension</b>	SL extension – five dwellings
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	12 dwellings/ha as promoted.
<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	Green	Access to the site should be achievable  <b>NCC Highways</b> - Amber - Yes - subject to carriageway widening and footway at site frontage - footway to link with existing adjacent f/w to east and bus stop to west. Frontage trees may require removal. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.	<b>Amber</b>
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	Distance to Barnham Broom Primary School 260 metres with footway  Distance to bus stops 200 metres  Distance to shop / post office 200 metres	



Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Barnham Broom sports pavilion and recreation area 460 metres  Distance to The Bell Inn public house 210 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Capacity TBC AW advise sewers crossing the site	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues  <b>SNC Env Services:</b> Land Quality - Having regard to the size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Road is at risk of surface water flooding and there is drainage ditch along the front of the site  <b>LLFA</b> - Few or no constraints.	Amber
<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	Limited landscape impact due to infill between existing development.  Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Would continue existing linear pattern of development	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No protected sites within close proximity  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green, but SSSI IRZ, potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets in close proximity  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Road is of reasonable standard and has footway  <b>NCC Highways</b> - Amber - Yes - subject to carriageway widening and footway at site frontage - footway to link with existing adjacent f/w to east and bus stop to west. Frontage trees may require removal. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.	<b>Amber</b>
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential  <b>SNC Env Services:</b> Amenity - No issues observed.	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Potential impact on non-designated heritage assets at Manor Farm. Would continue linear form of development to east resulting in loss of gap between Manor Farm and part of the settlement to the east.	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access likely to be achievable from Norwich Road, however confirmation needed that trees can be retained	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural 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>	Agricultural to south, residential to east and west. Woodland and further agricultural land on opposite side of road to north. 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>	Avenue of trees running along northern boundary	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Some habitat in trees and ditch to the front of the site.	
<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 running east-west along south of 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 and across site from public highway	
<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>	Extension of built form would erode existing undeveloped gap between two parts of the settlement harming landscape character for limited benefit. As such it is not considered suitable for settlement limit extension	Red

### Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations ( <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 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	
	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>	Potential carriageway widening and footway provision	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability – however the scale of the site is unlikely to require provision.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

#### ***Suitability***

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

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

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

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

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

#### ***Availability***

Promoter states the site is available.

#### ***Achievability***

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

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

#### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 15 October 2020

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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN4051
<b>Site address</b>	Land on the corner of Bell Road and Norwich Road, Barnham Broom
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	No relevant planning history
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	1.44 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension</b>	Allocation – 45-50 dwellings
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	Up to 35 dwellings/ha as promoted.
<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 providing access</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> - Green - Bell Rd/Mill Rd/Norwich Rd junction visibility is a constraint and would require realignment of Bell Rd to satisfactorily resolve. Bus stop relocation also required.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> – This site offers the opportunity to realign Bell Road and improve the current junction arrangement.</p>	<b>Green</b>
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	<p>Distance to Barnham Broom Primary School 500 metres with footway</p> <p>Bus stops on Norwich Road adjacent to site</p> <p>Shop / post office adjacent to site on opposite side of Bell Road</p>	



Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Barnham Broom sports pavilion and recreation area 520 metres  The Bell Inn public house adjacent to site on opposite side of Bell Road	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues  <b>SNV Env Services:</b> Land Quality - Having regard to the history of the site along with its size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified surface water flood risk on site  <b>LLFA</b> - Mitigation required for heavy constraints.	Amber
<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 ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B6 Yare Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Some potential coalescence of individual parts of Barnham Broom.</p> <p>Potential loss of high grade agricultural land.</p> <p><b>Landscape meeting</b> - Poor site in landscape terms as the site has significant landscape character issues. There would also be a loss of significant hedgerows.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Amber	<p>Limited existing development on eastern side of Bell Road</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage</b> – Amber, in terms of urban design, the village lacks a recognisable ‘heart’. This development site creates the opportunity to achieve that with well-designed public space. This would be near the post office and the bus stop – so could provide a useful village amenity. If we can achieve some positive outcomes like provision of village green etc that may be of some benefit and help towards created an enhanced sense of place.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No protected sites in close proximity</p> <p><b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green, but SSSI IRZ, potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain</p>	Green

Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Non-designated heritage assets on opposite side of Bell Road</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage</b> – Amber, it will affect to some degree the setting of the farm buildings to the east, which are however not listed, but can be considered non-designated heritage assets. It will also erode the gap in the settlement which divides the part of the village to the west from the eastern parts. Retaining hedgerow and landscape planting to the east could help mitigate these impacts.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Roads are of a reasonable standard and have footways</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> - Amber - Bell Rd/Mill Rd/Norwich Rd junction visibility is a constraint and would require realignment of Bell Rd to satisfactorily resolve. Bus stop relocation also required.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> – This site offers the opportunity to realign Bell Road and improve the current junction arrangement.</p>	<b>Amber</b>
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Agricultural and residential</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services:</b> Amenity - The site in question is close to The Bell Inn, Bell Road, Barnham Broom, Norfolk, NR9 4AA. Consideration should be given to the potential impact of the Public House on future residents along with the impact on the future viability of the Public House of introducing noise sensitive receptors close to it.</p>	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

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

<p><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></p>	<p>An allocation of 25 dwellings could be considered on the northern portion of the site as it is a location which could strengthen the nucleated core of the village, albeit by extending estate development east of Bell Road with erosion of gap between different parts of settlement. This is subject to an access being achievable with no loss of important trees and minimising any loss of hedgerow and surface water flood risk issues being addressed</p>	<p>Amber</p>
--	--	--------------

### Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations <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? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
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>	Some footway improvements may be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

#### ***Suitability***

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

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

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

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

Outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

#### ***Availability***

Promoter states the site is available.

#### ***Achievability***

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

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

#### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 15 October 2020

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

**Part 1 Site Details**

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN4078
<b>Site address</b>	South of Batchawana, Bell Road, Barnham Broom
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	None relevant.
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.42 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension</b>	Up to 10 self-build dwellings
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	24 dwellings/ha as promoted
<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	Site has a wide field access on to 30mph road, with pavement on the opposite side.	Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities		Distance to Barnham Broom Primary School 780 metres with footway	
<i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport		Distance to bus stops 200 metres  Distance to shop / post office 200 metres	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Barnham Broom sports pavilion and recreation area 980 metres  Distance to The Bell Inn public house 100 metres	Green

Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified surface water flood risk on 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> )		B6 Yare Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	No designated landscapes.  Potential intrusion into open landscape on the east side of Bell Road.  Potential loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Limited existing development on eastern side of Bell Road. The site would break the prevailing pattern of development in this location and therefore could have a negative impact on the character of the area.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green

Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Road is of reasonable standard and has footway.	Green
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>	Very limited development on east side of Bell Road. Whilst development to the north on the eastern side of Bell Road could potentially work in creating a nucleated core to the village, development on this site on its own would appear incongruous and have a negative impact on the character of the area and the street scene.	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access should be achievable from Bell Road, as the site has two adjoining field accessed.	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural land 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>	Agricultural land to east and south. Single residential dwelling to north with residential development on opposite side of Bell Road to west	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Site itself is largely level. Wider field falls away to south.	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedge and trees (but broken by large field accesses) on Bell Road. Domestic hedge on boundary with property to north. East and south boundaries are undefined as part of larger field. Boundary within site consists of post and wire fencing.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Some habitat potential in hedges 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 are possible from Bell Road, particularly from the field access where long views across the site are possible looking to the wider landscape to the south-east	

<p><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></p>	<p>Development would appear incongruous on this side of Bell Road away from the centre of the village, and would have a negative impact on the character of the area and the street scene. The site also forms part of two larger fields, with no obvious boundaries to the east and south.</p>	<p>Red</p>
--	---	------------

### Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations <i>(UNIFORM)</i>	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside		
<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>	Site is being promoted for self-build units.		
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	
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Footway improvements may be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

#### ***Suitability***

Site could potentially be a small allocation of 12 dwellings or a settlement limit.

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

Limited development on eastern side of Bell Road. Whilst there may be some potential for development on the eastern side of the road closer to the centre of the village, it is considered that in this location development would appear incongruous and would have a negative impact on the character of the area and the street scene. The site also forms part of two larger fields, with no obvious boundaries to the east and south.

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

Outside but adjacent to the development boundary (on the opposite side of Bell Road).

#### ***Availability***

Promoter states the site is available.

#### ***Achievability***

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

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** Unreasonable - The site is promoted for a Settlement Limit extension on the east side of Bell Road, where there is currently only an individual dwelling outside the Limit. Development would appear incongruous and would have a negative impact on the character of the area and the street scene. The site subdivides two larger fields, with no obvious boundaries to the east or south.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 15 October 2020