

Hempnall, Topcroft St, Morningthorpe,
Fritton, Shelton & Hardwick
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

Contents

SN0147	3
SN0178SL	10
SN0220	17
SN0580	26
SN1015	33
SN1016	41
SN1017	49
SN1018	57
SN2029SL (site 1) (assessed with SN2146)	64
SN2046	71
SN2146 (site 2 and 3) (assessed with SN2029)	85
SN4012	92
SN4083	98

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0147
Site address	Land around Alburgh Road and Silver Green, Sycamore Farm, 17 Alburgh Road, Hempnall Green
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Permissions associated with farm use
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	13.17 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Mixed use to include business/industrial and community – residential densities unspecified (25 dph = 342 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Part - greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Main access from Alburgh Road and field access from Silver Green. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS - Red Not feasible to construct a satisfactory access. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There is no safe walking route to the catchment school</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	2.1 km walk to primary school Local retail and limited employment opportunities within 1800m Bus service including peak (bus stop nearby)	
		Village hall (with groups) and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, electricity and mains sewer to site. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Site is potentially contaminated due to previous use. Investigation required.	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified in eastern and northern sections and along highway boundary.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact which may be mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of the site at the scale promoted would have a detrimental impact which could not be mitigated. Impacts would be limited through a reduction in site area	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Ponds close to western and eastern boundaries. Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of heritage assets. Impact may be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development at scale promoted likely to harm setting of LBs to north, west and south. Harm could be limited by reduction in site area, design and boundary treatment.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing wide access serves site. Scope for further improvements. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to west and agriculture to other boundaries	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow (including trees) to most boundaries, more open to NE section	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant hedgerow along highway boundary. Ponds close to western and eastern boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views from north east and from Silver Green to south.	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Development at scale promoted would have adverse impact on form, character and landscape, heritage assets and existing residential amenity. NCC to comment on impact on local highway network.	Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	None	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	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</i>	No supporting information submitted	Amber

<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>	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site is not considered suitable for allocation due to its scale at which it is promoted. Even with a reduction in size there are constraints relating townscape, landscape, connectivity and heritage considerations. Highways have also raised concerns over the feasibility of creating a satisfactory access.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Development at scale promoted would have adverse impact on form, character and landscape, heritage assets and existing residential amenity.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified</p> <p>Achievability No constraints identified</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: the site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE site for allocation. The site is considered to be remote from services and facilities where highway safety concerns have also been identified. Access is via field access from Silver Green where it is considered not feasible to construct a satisfactory access and there is no safe walking route to the catchment school. Heritage and landscape constraints have also been identified.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 15 September 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0178SL
Site address	Land adjacent Tween Oaks, Alburgh Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.4 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	4 dwellings = 10 dph (25 dph= 10 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Field access from Alburgh Road. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development NCC HIGHWAYS-Amber A satisfactory access may be feasible but would require removal of frontage hedge/trees and provision of a 2.0m wide footway.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	2 km walk to primary school Local retail and limited employment opportunities within 1800m Bus service including peak	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall (with groups) and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Area of identified flood risk along southern boundary.	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact which may be mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Drain along part of eastern boundary. Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of heritage assets which could be reasonably mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	NCC HIGHWAYS- Red The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There is no safe walking route to the catchment school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Any impacts of development at scale promoted on heritage assets to south likely to be mitigated through design and landscaping.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Field access only. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable. Would require removal of significant hedgerow	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north, south and east. Agricultural to west.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open to larger parcel of farmland to west. Other boundaries enclosed by hedgerow.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant hedgerow and trees along highway boundary. Drain in SE section of site.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Telegraph poles and O/H lines along eastern boundary	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views from west. Other boundaries enclosed by hedgerow. Prominent in views along road.	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Some residential on western side of Alburgh Road and development at scale promoted could be mitigated by design and landscaping. However, would result in loss of significant hedgerow. to detrimental of character of lane. NCC to comment on impact on local highway network.	Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	None	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	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</i>	No supporting information submitted	Amber

<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>	A satisfactory access may be feasible but would require removal of frontage hedge/trees and provision of a 2.0m wide footway.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	N/A	
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site is of a suitable size to be considered as a settlement limit extension however it would represent a significant breakout to the west of the Hempnall. Identified desktop constraints include highways, landscape impact and potential heritage issues.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Some residential on western side of Alburgh Road and development at scale promoted could be mitigated by design and landscaping. However, would result in loss of significant hedgerow. to detrimental of character of lane.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations - open countryside</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified</p> <p>Achievability No constraints identified</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE as an extension to the existing settlement limit of Hempnall. The site is remote from services where there is also no safe walking route to the catchment school. Whilst some residential development is located on the western side of Alburgh Road and development at scale promoted could be mitigated by design and landscaping, it has been noted that development would result in loss of significant hedgerow which would be detrimental of character of the lane. The site is open to larger parcels of farmland to the west where there the site would be prominent in this direction.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 16 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

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

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
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)

<p>Access to the site</p>	<p>Amber</p>	<p>Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – (Approx 15 dwellings) subject to Millfields being widened. Millfields is a private road with a minimum width of approx. 2.75m, assuming access can be secured between the site and the public network, the access road will need to be widened to a minimum of 4.5m plus a footway. Visibility at the junction with the B1527 looks reasonable. A safe crossing to facilitate journeys to school should be provided between the site and Field Lane to the east. Improvement required to pedestrian route at Mill Road junction with The Street</p> <p>Updated - NCC HIGHWAYS - main issue is the width of the current private road, which would need widening to 5.8m for a shared surface, or at least 4.8m plus a 1.8m foot way for non-shared</p>	<p>Amber</p>
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	<p>Green</p>	<p>650m safe walk to primary school</p> <p>Doctor surgery, local retail and employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Peak bus service (450m walk to stop)</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Community centre with groups and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. Sub station within site on northern boundary which could constrain development	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Low risk of flooding	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		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)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grades 3/4	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER- No landscapes issues	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated through design	Amber

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on setting of heritage asset to east but impact could be reasonably mitigated SNC HERITAGE OFFICER – likely requirement for limiting height due to neighbouring existing bungalow development around the setting of the Mill.	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential/allotments	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Will have some impact on setting of the listed mill – but not significant considering Millfields and the mill have already been developed	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access constrained. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential development to east, allotments to north, agriculture to west and south - compatible	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open to south. Fencing and intermittent hedgerow to other boundaries.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Nothing of significance	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	UKPN sub-station on northern boundary near access	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views from south	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Safe walking route to primary school and well connected to other local services. Landscape and townscape impacts could be mitigated through design which should reflect scale and character of adjoining)and have regard to setting of listed mill. NCC to confirm satisfactory access.	Green

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	private		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Enquiries received		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	X	Green
	Within 5 years		
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional</i>	Statement from promoter advising same	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>	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 21 August 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0580
Site address	Land at Home Farm, Alburgh Road, Hempnall Green
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.94 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	11 – 23 dph (12-25 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Field access from Alburgh Road. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS- Amber A satisfactory access may be feasible but would require removal of frontage hedge/trees and provision of a 2.0m wide footway. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There is no safe walking route to the catchment school.</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	2.2 km walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 1800m Bus service including peak	
		Pub within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No identified areas of flood risk within site	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact which may be mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development of the site may have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not have a detrimental impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets. NCC HEC - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Not likely to have any direct impacts on heritage assets.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural land abutting with residential nearby	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site bounded by hedgerows	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site bounded by hedgerows with some significant trees although not along highway. Some loss of hedgerow likely for access improvements	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site visually contained but prominent in views from highway	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Development at scale promoted would have suburbanising effect outside settlement boundary. Could be reduced by limiting to frontage site only but connectivity issues remain. NCC to comment on impact on local highway network.	Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)	
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	private		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	None		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately		
	Within 5 years	X	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		Green

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>	No supporting information submitted	Amber

<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>	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability Not considered suitable for allocation at scale promoted due lack of connectivity and impacts on townscape and landscape. Highways issues also likely to constrain development at scale promoted.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Development at scale promoted would have suburbanising effect outside settlement boundary. Could be reduced by limiting to frontage site only but connectivity issues remain. NCC to comment on impact on local highway network.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.</p> <p>Achievability No further constraints identified.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE as an allocated site due to unresolvable highway issues and impact on landscape and townscape. The site is considered to be remote from services where access to the site would require the removal of frontage hedge/trees and provision of a 2.0m wide footway as there is no safe walking route to the catchment school.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 16 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN1015
Site address	Land adjacent to the primary school, The Street
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.6 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approx. 19 dwellings = 12 dph (25 dph = 40 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Existing access from The Street, Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS - May not be able to achieve acceptable visibility. 2,0m wide footway required at frontage along with carriageway widening to 5.5m minimum. Highway constrained in vicinity of site.</p> <p>Updated comments - would be preferable in highways terms (by a considerable margin), adjacent to the new vehicular access for the primary school.</p>	Amber

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	Green	Adjacent to primary school Doctor surgery, local retail and employment opportunities within 1800m Peak bus service (on bus route)	
		Community centre, recreation ground and village groups within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has not advised services to site. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified in western section and close to existing access	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		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>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design SNC Landscape officer: significant levels changes across the site which currently serves as the access to the primary school	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts on form and character of settlement. Impacts may be limited by reduced site area.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of Has to south and west and on character of CA. Impact may be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential/education/vacant land	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

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

Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Very accessible to local services and public transport. However, a complicated site with significant changes in ground level. Heritage and flood risk issues and congestion of existing highway network	Amber
--	---	-------

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	None	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	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 statement from promoter addressing traffic, heritage and landscape	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Land for expansion of primary school	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

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

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

Local Plan Designations Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability No further constraints identified.

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

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 21 August 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN1016
Site address	Land at Busseys Loke
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.3 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 40 dwellings = 30 dph (25 dph = 32 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing access from Busseys Loke. NCC HIGHWAYS – Red Unlikely to be able to provide sufficient access visibility due to alignment of road. Bussey's Loke is narrow with restricted forward visibility and no footway, visibility from Bussey's Loke to The Street is sub-standard. Local highway network is not suitable for development traffic. No safe walking route to the catchment school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	300m walk to primary school Doctor surgery, local retail and employment opportunities within 1800m Peak bus service	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Community centre, recreation ground and village groups within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has not advised services to site. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified at southern boundary and outside of eastern boundary.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be mitigated through design	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts on form and character of settlement may be mitigated through design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be mitigated	Amber

Historic Environment	Red	Development likely to cause harm to designated assets that could not be reasonably mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber/Red
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	Development likely to have unacceptable impact on road network that could not be reasonably mitigated	Amber/Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Abuts eastern boundary of CA. Likely to harm setting of heritage assets to west and south and especially open setting of grade I listed church. Technical officer to confirm.	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Existing field access from Busseys Loke, close to bend on narrow lane. The Street. NCC to confirm if access achievable given restricted width but also likely to require removal of significant amount of hedgerow in rural lane.	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agriculture	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential development to south, agriculture to north and east, cemetery to west - compatible	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Generally flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Established hedgerow with some significant trees/fencing.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Trees within existing hedgerows. Watercourse at southern end of 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>	No evidence of contamination or utilities	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Site enclosed by hedgerows but transected by PROWs	

Initial site visit conclusion <i>(NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</i>	Reasonably close to local services and public transport but lacking footpath provision. Development as promoted would harm rural landscape character as separated from settlement by church and cemetery Would have significant impact on heritage, local highway network, PROWs and trees/hedgerows.	Amber/red
---	---	-----------

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	None	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	

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

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability Not considered suitable for allocation due to issues of heritage, highways, landscape, townscape and flood risk

Site Visit Observations Reasonably close to local services and public transport but lacking footpath provision. Development as promoted would harm rural landscape character as separated from settlement by church and cemetery Would have significant impact on heritage, local highway network, PROWs and trees/hedgerows.

Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations

Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability Would require diversion of PROWs

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** as an allocated site. The site would have a poor relationship with the existing form and character of the settlement. Whilst the site is reasonably close to local services and public transport, it is lacking footpath provision. Significant access and highway network constraints have been identified and are considered to be barriers to the delivery of this site. The site is also heavily constrained by 2 PROW's (PF7 and PF8) which would require diverting as they cross the middle of the site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed 13 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN1017
Site address	Land at Broaden Lane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic applications for residential development refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25 dwellings = 23 dph (25 dph = 25 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing access from Broaden Lane. NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber The appears site to have sufficient frontage to provide acceptable visibility but the existing frontage hedge would need to be removed, a 2.0m wide footway would be required for the full extent of the frontage. There is no footway between the site and Fairstead Lane, as such a safe walking route to school is not available and an acceptable facility doesn't appear feasible within the highway. The Street is constrained south of the site and unsuitable for development traffic.	Amber

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> o Primary School o Secondary school o Local healthcare services o Retail services o Local employment opportunities o Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus o Village/ community hall o Public house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Green	450m walk to primary school Doctor surgery, local retail and employment opportunities within 1800m Bus service including peak (bus stop nearby)	
		Community centre, recreation ground and village groups within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has not confirmed services to site. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified along highway and adjacent to south western corner of site	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	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	
		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER -This site is not acceptable in landscape terms. Development of this site would be harmful in landscape character terms. This is a gateway site with changes in levels and a solid hedgerow along the site frontage.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts may not be reasonably mitigated through design.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Pond close to western boundary. Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of LB to west. Impact may be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated NCC HIGHWAYS – Red The appears site to have sufficient frontage to provide acceptable visibility but the existing frontage hedge would need to be removed, a 2.0m wide footway would be required for the full extent of the frontage. There is no footway between the site and Fairstead Lane, as such a safe walking route to school is not available and an acceptable facility doesn't appear feasible within the highway. The Street is constrained south of the site and unsuitable for development traffic.	Red

Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agriculture/residential	Green
------------------------	-------	-------------------------	-------

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Impact on setting of LB to west could be mitigated through design and boundary treatment. AAI to north and west of site so further investigation required.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Narrow lane with boundary hedgerow slightly raised from carriageway. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable and impact on local network.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture to south, west and north and residential development to east.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow (including trees) to eastern, western and southern boundaries. Northern boundary open.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant hedgerow along highway boundary. Pond close to western boundary	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views from north and prominent in views from the highway	

<p>Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>Site adjacent to bus stop but lack of continuous footpath affects accessibility to other local services. Not likely to be achievable due to lack of land and third party ownerships. Separation from nearest development to south and density as promoted would have adverse impact on form and character of settlement. Loss of some significant hedgerow to provide visibility would also adversely affect character of lane.</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)
Open countryside		
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	None	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	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 statement from promoter addressing traffic, heritage and landscape	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability the site is not considered suitable for allocation due to issues of townscape, landscape and connectivity. Heritage and highways issues would also constrain development.

Site Visit Observations Site adjacent to bus stop but lack of continuous footpath affects accessibility to other local services. Not likely to be achievable due to lack of land and third party ownerships. Separation from nearest development to south and density as promoted would have adverse impact on form and character of settlement. Loss of some significant hedgerow to provide visibility would also adversely affect character of lane.

Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations

Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability No additional supporting evidence submitted

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** and is not suitable for inclusion as an allocation.

The site relates poorly to the existing services, including the primary school, and would have a poor relationship with the existing form and character of the settlement. Development of this site would be harmful in landscape character terms; the site is open in views from the north and west with prominent in views from the highway.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 15 September 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN1018
Site address	Land south of Millfields
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approx. 75 dwellings = 25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS- Red Not possible to achieve acceptable visibility for access within highway or site frontage. Field Lane is narrow with no footway. There is no safe walking route to the catchment school.</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	Green	<p>800m walk to primary school</p> <p>Doctor surgery, local retail and employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Peak bus service (400m walk to stop)</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Community centre, recreation ground and village groups within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has not confirmed any utilities to site. No other constraints identified	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Low risk of flooding. No other risk identified	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grades 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Detrimental impacts on character of river valley may not be reasonably mitigated due to scale of development promoted. Impacts may be limited by reduced site area.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts on form and character of settlement. Impacts may be limited by reduced site area.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of heritage asset to north but impact could be mitigated depending upon scale of development. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	May impact on setting of the listed mill depending on scale of any development	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access very constrained. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable. Development would limit access to remaining farmland	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential development to east and north. Agriculture to west and south - compatible	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow and fencing. Open to south	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Any trees/hedgerow to boundaries only	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of constraints	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views from south and from river valley to west	
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)	Reasonable walking route to primary school but some footpath improvement required. Accessible to other local services. Significant landscape and townscape impacts due to scale of development promoted. Access and heritage constraints also identified	Green

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)				
	Comments			Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	private			
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	None			
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately			
	Within 5 years	X		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</i>	Statement from promoter advising same	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>	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability Not considered suitable for allocation at this time. Significant impact on form and character of settlement due to scale of development promoted. A reduced site area (eastern section only) would also have significant access constraints.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Safe walking route to primary school but some footpath improvement required. Accessible to other local services. Significant landscape and townscape impacts due to scale of development promoted. Access and heritage constraints also identified</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Promoter has advised availability within plan period.</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.</p> <p>Achievability Access very constrained. Improvements likely to require third party land</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE due to the significant highway safety issues and constraints resulting from the narrow width of the access off Field Lane with no footway. It has also been considered that visibility is not achievable within highway and site frontage. Even with a reduction in site size, the highway issues are considered to be unresolvable.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 21 August 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2029SL (site 1) (assessed with SN2146)
Site address	West of Topcroft Street, Toftcroft
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic approval and refusal for residential
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6 ha (over 3 sites)
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	At least 5 dwellings (over 3 sites)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield/brownfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing accesses also serving residential/farm. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development NCC HIGHWAYS – Red Site remote from local services and catchment primary school. No continuous footway to catchment school. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of its road width and lack of footways. Access would require localised carriageway widening, 2m frontage footway and removal of frontage hedge.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	More than 3km km walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 1800m Limited bus service	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall within 1800m	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Site 1 within FZ 2 & 3. All sites within identified SW flow path	Red
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development of the site may have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber

Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets but the impact could be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Site 1 -agriculture/residential Sites 2 & 3 – residential/paddock	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Site 1 – likely to harm open setting of HA immediately to north. Sites 2 & 3 – harm to nearest HAs could be mitigated through design	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing accesses shared with farm/residential uses. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site bounded by hedgerow with trees	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site 1 enclosed by hedgerow with some trees. Access improvement would result in some loss. Sites 2 & 3 open to road with some trees to northern and western boundaries.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence.	

Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	All sites prominent in views form highway	
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)	Sites on limited bus route but remote from most local services including school. All sites constrained by identified flood risk. Development on site 1 would be likely to harm setting of HAs. Townscape impact of development on Sites 2 & 3 could be mitigated through design but development of site 1 would result in encroachment to north.	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		
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	None	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	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>	No supporting information submitted	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability Not considered suitable for allocation due lack of connectivity to local services and impacts on townscape, landscape, heritage assets and flood risk.

Site Visit Observations Sites on limited bus route but remote from most local services including school. All sites constrained by identified flood risk. Development on site 1 would be likely to harm setting of HAs. Townscape impact of development on Sites 2 & 3 could be mitigated through design but development of site 1 would result in encroachment to north.

Local Plan Designations Open countryside

Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability No additional supporting evidence submitted

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** site for a SL Extension. The site relates poorly to the existing services, including the local school which is over a 3km walk where there is no continuous footpath. It has also been noted that the development would impact on the heritage asset immediately north, where there are also concerns that development here would result in encroachment. The site has also been identified to fall within Flood Zone 2 and 3 which could heavily constrain developable land.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2046
Site address	Land at Pear Tree Farm, Hempnall
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Article 4 direction. Historic refusals for residential development. 2016/2988 Class Q prior approval for barn conversion.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.5 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified (25 dph = 27 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield/brownfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
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 from Alburgh Road and field access from Lundy Green.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – A satisfactory access may be feasible but would require removal of frontage hedge/trees and provision of a 2.0m wide footway. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There is no safe walking route to the catchment school.</p>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	<p>2.5 km walk to primary school</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Bus service including peak</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Pub within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Area of identified flood risk along eastern boundary.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact which may be mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development of the site may have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber

Historic Environment	Amber	Development would not have a detrimental impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets. NCC HEC - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Not likely to have any direct impacts on heritage assets.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing residential and field access. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture with residential/commercial on east side of crossroads.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site bounded by hedgerow with trees	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site bounded by hedgerows with some significant trees also within southern half of site. Pond in western section of site. Some loss of trees and hedgerow likely for access improvements	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence although previous agricultural activity may result in some contamination	

Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site visually contained but prominent in views from highway	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Development at scale promoted would have suburbanising effect outside settlement boundary. Trees and pond within site would constrain developable area. NCC to comment on impact on local highway network.	Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	None	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	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>	No supporting information submitted	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability Not considered suitable for allocation due lack of connectivity and impacts on townscape, landscape, trees and ecology. Highways issues also likely to constrain development at scale promoted.

Site Visit Observations Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Development at scale promoted would have suburbanising effect outside settlement boundary. Trees and pond within site would constrain developable area. NCC to comment on impact on local highway network.

Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations

Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability No additional supporting evidence submitted

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is an **UNREASONABLE** option for a settlement limit extension due to its poor connectivity and relationship to services, including the primary school. There is also no safe walking route to the catchment school. The site is heavily constrained by significant tree cover within the southern half of the site and by a pond located within the western section of the site (where is also identified surface water risk). This would reduce the area of developable land.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 18 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2081
Site address	West of Feld Lane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.39 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approx. 40 dwellings = 17 dph (25 dph = 59 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
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>Field access at northern end.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Field Lane becomes constrained at the southern extent of the built area with an apparent available width of 6m, this may affect the ability to provide the required 5.5m c/w plus 2m f/w. In addition to the site frontage, footway would need to be provided to link with existing facility, approx. 300m.</p> <p>Updated comments - strong objections to this site, the road has high banks/hedging and no footway. Likely that most/all frontage trees/hedge would need to be removed. Even if this were possible, there still looks to be a constraint at the northern end of the site.</p>	Red

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	950m walk to primary school Doctor surgery, local retail and employment opportunities within 1800m Peak bus service (500m walk to stop)	
		Community centre, recreation ground and village groups within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewer and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified in NW and SW sections and along Field Lane	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may not be reasonably mitigated due to scale of development promoted. Impacts may be limited by reduced site area.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts on form and character of settlement. Impacts may be limited by reduced site area.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of heritage asset to north but impact could be mitigated depending upon scale of development NCC HEC - Amber SNC Heritage Officer – Amber No objections.	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impact on listed buildings although archaeological investigation will be required.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access at northern end. During 2019 assessments, NCC expressed concern whether safe access could be achieved – confirm this.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential development to north and south. Agriculture to west and east - compatible	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries enclosed by hedgerow	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Well established hedgerow along boundary with lane	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	O/H lines and telegraph poles along eastern boundary with lane	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Visually contained by hedgerows but prominent in views along lane	
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)	Reasonable walking route to primary school and accessible to other local services but some footpath improvement required. Development of whole site would have a significant impact on form and character of settlement. Hedgerow along Field Lane should be retained	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		
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)				
	Comments			Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	private			
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	None			
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately			
	Within 5 years	X		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</i>	Statement from promoter advising same	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>	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability Subject to a reduction in scale the site is considered suitable for allocation for up to 20 dwellings in eastern section only, subject to satisfactory access, footpath improvements and retention of hedgerow along lane.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Reasonable walking route to primary school and accessible to other local services but footpath improvement required. Development of whole site would have a significant impact on form and character of settlement. Hedgerow along Field Lane should be retained</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Promoter has advised availability within plan period.</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.</p> <p>Achievability Subject to achieving safe access – obtain early comments from NCC</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE as an allocated site due to unresolvable highway issues. The site is accessed via Field Lane to the west which has banks/hedging and no footway. It is considered that most/all frontage trees/hedge would need to be removed in order to create a satisfactory access where it has been advised that hedgerow along Field Lane should be retained Landscape constraints have identified that development of site would have a significant impact on form and character of settlement.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 21 August 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2146 (site 2 and 3) (assessed with SN2029)
Site address	West of The Street
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic approval and refusal for residential
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6 ha (over 3 sites)
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	At least 5 dwellings (over 3 sites)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield/brownfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing accesses also serving residential/farm. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development. NCC HIGHWAY – red Site remote from local services and catchment primary school. No continuous footway to catchment school. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of its road width and lack of footways. Access would require localised carriageway widening, 2m frontage footway and removal of frontage hedge.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	More than 3km km walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 1800m Limited bus service	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall within 1800m	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Site 1 within FZ 2 & 3. All sites within identified SW flow path	Red
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development of the site may have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber

Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets but the impact could be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Site 1 -agriculture/residential Sites 2 & 3 – residential/paddock	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site 1 – likely to harm open setting of HA immediately to north. Sites 2 & 3 – harm to nearest HAs could be mitigated through design	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing accesses shared with farm/residential uses. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site bounded by hedgerow with trees	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site 1 enclosed by hedgerow with some trees. Access improvement would result in some loss. Sites 2 & 3 open to road with some trees to northern and western boundaries.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence.	

Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	All sites prominent in views form highway	
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)	Sites on limited bus route but remote from most local services including school. All sites constrained by identified flood risk. Development on site 1 would be likely to harm setting of HAs. Townscape impact of development on Sites 2 & 3 could be mitigated through design but development of site 1 would result in encroachment to north.	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		
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	None	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	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>	No supporting information submitted	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes. Access would require localised carriageway widening, 2m frontage footway and removal of frontage hedge.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site is considered a suitable size for a SL Extension. The site lacks connectivity to local services and impacts on townscape, landscape and heritage assets have been identified.

Site Visit Observations Sites on limited bus route but remote from most local services including school. All sites constrained by identified flood risk. Development on site 1 would be likely to harm setting of HAs. Townscape impact of development on Sites 2 & 3 could be mitigated through design but development of site 1 would result in encroachment to north.

Local Plan Designations Open countryside

Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability No additional supporting evidence submitted

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered an **UNREASONABLE** option for an extension to the existing settlement limit, due to highway constraints. Development of the site would also conflict with the linear pattern of development with potential harm to the character of the settlement. The site relates poorly to the existing services, including the local school which is a 3km walk and has no continuous footpath link. Heritage and surface water flood issues have been identified; however, these could be mitigated.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4012
Site address	Land west of Low Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.57 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension	Allocated
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	At least 12 dwellings = 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Field access at junction of Low Road/Church Lane. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities	Red	More than 3km walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 1800m Limited bus service	
<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		Village hall within 1800m	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber

Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, foul drainage and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Within flood zone 1. Identified SW flood risk along adjacent highways and adjoining land to NE.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development of the site may have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets but the impact could be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts on designated or non-designated HAs	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access on junction. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable from either road. Some oak on boundaries that may impact visibility.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries open to highways and adjoining land. Field oak dispersed along both highway boundaries.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Field oak along highway boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	O/H lines along Church lane frontage	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from highways and adjoining land	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site remote from most local services including school. Development at scale promoted would have suburbanising effect and harm open character of landscape. Likely to have adverse impact on 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)
Open countryside		
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	None	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	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</i>	No supporting information submitted	Amber

<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>	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability Not considered suitable for allocation due lack of connectivity to local services and impacts on townscape, landscape, heritage assets and flood risk.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Site remote from most local services including school. Development at scale promoted would have suburbanising effect and harm open character of landscape. Likely to have adverse impact on local highway network.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Open countryside</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.</p> <p>Achievability No additional supporting evidence submitted</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered an UNREASONABLE option for allocation or inclusion in settlement limit due to its remoteness from the services and facilities within the village cluster, exacerbated by the lack of footways. The site is also considered to be out of keeping in terms of form and character, whilst the site is adjacent to residential dwellings, the site is detached from the main part of Topcroft to the south.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4083
Site address	Land at Bungay Road, Hempnall
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9 ha (estimated, not confirmed by promoter)
Promoted Site Use, including (aa) Allocated site (bb) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified (25 dph = 22 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
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	Shared access from Bungay Road. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities	Green	700m walk to primary school Employment opportunities within 1800m Bus service	
<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		Village hall within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber

Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter has not confirmed utilities. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Western side of site within FZs 2 & 3. Identified SW flood risk across western and northern sections and along highway. No supporting evidence submitted. LLFA – Amber Mitigation required for heavy constraints. Significant information required at a planning stage. The site is adjacent to significant flooding (flowpath). This must be considered in the site assessment.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development of the site may have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber

Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets but the impact could be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Would have impact on setting of LB to west. Would only be mitigated by design and reduction in site area	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing shared access onto Bungay Road. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open to highways and remaining boundaries enclosed by hedgerow with some trees.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Watercourse along northern boundary. Several trees along northern and eastern boundaries.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	

Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from highways and adjoining land	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site reasonably close to local services. No footpath provision for first 50m and no land appears available for improvements. Frontage development only would reflect existing pattern of development and limit landscape and heritage impacts. Appear to be significant flood risk constraints. No supporting information submitted in this respect.	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		
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Not confirmed	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	Amber
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments: Not confirmed	

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>	No supporting information submitted	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Not confirmed	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No evidence	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability Not considered suitable for allocation at scale promoted due lack of connectivity and impacts on townscape, landscape, heritage assets and flood risk.

Site Visit Observations Site reasonably close to local services. No footpath provision for first 50m and no land appears available for improvements. Frontage development only would reflect existing pattern of development and limit townscape, landscape and heritage impacts. Appear to be significant flood risk constraints. No supporting information submitted in this respect.

Local Plan Designations Open countryside

Availability No additional supporting evidence submitted

Achievability No additional supporting evidence submitted

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** site for allocation. Frontage development would limit landscape and heritage impacts, however identified flood risk constraints are likely to restrict development on the western part of the site which is closest to the existing settlement. This could result in a poor relationship between new development and existing development along Bungay Road. Whilst the site is reasonably close to local services there is no footpath provision for the first 50m of the site and there appears to be no land available for improvements.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020