

# Ketteringham Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

## Contents

|              |    |
|--------------|----|
| SN0473 ..... | 3  |
| SN0513 ..... | 11 |
| SN0528 ..... | 20 |
| SN3031 ..... | 31 |

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

### Part 1 Site Details

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site Reference</b>   | SN0473   |
| <b>Site address</b>   | Land at Church Road, Ketteringham                  |
| <b>Current planning status<br/>(including previous planning policy status)</b>  | Unallocated  |
| <b>Planning History</b>   | FH\3970\ Site for residential development. Refused |
| <b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>  | 0.92ha   |
| <b>Promoted Site Use, including<br/>(a) Allocated site<br/>(b) SL extension</b> | Allocated Site                                     |
| <b>Promoted Site Density<br/>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>  | 5 – 10 houses – assume 25dph                       |
| <b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>   | Greenfield   |

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

| SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT  |                       |   |                      |
|---|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Constraint  | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
| Access to the site  | Green                 | <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b><br>Unlikely to be able to achieve acceptable visibility. No safe walking route to catchment school.   | Red                  |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities  | Red                   | No village Shop<br><br>Bus stop within 1.90km at Old Hall School Hethersett and is on the bus route for Konectbus 6<br><br>Hethersett Junior and Academy are 2.85km<br><br>No footpaths | Red                  |
| <i>Part 1:</i><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul><br><i>Part 2:</i><br>Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul> |                       | Village Hall 927m<br><br>Recreational ground 3.28km<br><br>Range of services in Hethersett 3km<br><br>Ketteringham Hall complex with Orchard Nursery School, tea rooms etc 500m         | Amber                |

|  |                              |  |                             |
|--|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Utilities Capacity   | Amber                        | Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed   | Amber                       |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                        | Promoter advises water, sewage (?) and electricity available to site.  | Green                       |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk                                     |                              | The site is within an area already served by fibre technology  | Green                       |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route                                    |                              | Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location   | Green                       |
| Contamination & ground stability                                 | Green                        | The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.   | Green                       |
| Flood Risk   | Green                        | Flood zone 1, Surface Water flooding in the road   | Green                       |
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
| SN Landscape Type<br>( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )        |                              | Rural River Valley   |                             |
|  |                              | Tributary Farmland   |                             |
|  |                              | Tributary Farmland with Parkland   |                             |
|  |                              | Settled Plateau Farmland   | X                           |
|  |                              | Plateau Farmland   |                             |
|  |                              | Valley Urban Fringe  |                             |
|  |                              | Fringe Farmland  |                             |
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) |                              | D1 - Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland  |                             |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                     | Green                        | Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated.  | Amber                       |
| Townscape  | Amber                        | The site is detached from the main part of the village. The site is currently used as an agricultural field with significant trees, adjacent a County Wildlife Site. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character. | Amber                       |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity                                      | Amber                        | Site adjacent to Bean and Outer Park Woods – County Wildlife Park Development may impact on protected species, which may not be reasonably mitigated.  | Amber                       |

|                        |       |  |       |
|------------------------|-------|--|-------|
| Historic Environment   | Amber | Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby Ketteringham Hall and other LB located to the southeast but could be reasonably mitigated.<br><br><b>NCC HES - Amber</b>  | Amber |
| Open Space             | Green | Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space   | Green |
| Transport and Roads    | Amber | The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision.<br><br><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b><br>The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport mode | Amber |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green | Residential and Agricultural   | Green |

#### Part 4 Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?  | <p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB' s, particularly Ketteringham Hall . Noted that the Listed buildings are separated by intervening uses.</p> <p>The site is detached from the main part of the village. The site is currently used as an agricultural field with significant trees, adjacent a County Wildlife Site. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.</p> |                         |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?   | Unlikely to be able to achieve acceptable visibility. Potential access constraints as there are existing to site frontage.   |                         |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Agricultural and access to woodland Grade 3  |                         |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)  | Sited adjacent to mature woodland. County Wildlife Site, Residential and Agricultural  |                         |
| 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)  | Significant trees, hedges and vegetation   |                         |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?   | <p>Site adjacent to Bean and Outer Park Woods – County Wildlife Park Development may impact on protected species, which may not be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Again loss of trees etc to provide for the development would have impact which may not reasonably mitigated.</p>   |                         |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | None   |                         |

|  |  |           |
|--|--|-----------|
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | Views into the site are limited due to existing trees and vegetation. However, the development would be visible from the surrounding road network.   |           |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Not adjacent to the development boundary, separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the south of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate. | Amber/Red |

### Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations ( <i>UNIFORM</i> ) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Open Countryside                           |   |                      |
|  |   |                      |
|  |   |                      |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                          | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green                |



## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** Not considered suitable, due to separation from the main village, no existing development boundary. Potential adverse impacts on Heritage assets, landscape and highway safety.

**Site Visit Observations** Not adjacent to the development boundary, separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the south of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

**Local Plan Designations** Within open countryside

**Availability** Promoter has advised availability immediately

**Achievability** No additional constraints identified

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is not a **REASONABLE** option for allocation due to its physical separation from the main settlement, access issues and the detrimental townscape impact its development would have. Development of the site would represent a breakout to the south of the village where views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network. The site is also located adjacent to Bean and Outer Park Woods – County Wildlife Park where development may impact on protected species, which may not be reasonably mitigated.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 7/01/2021

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

### Part 1 Site Details

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Site Reference   | SN0513   |
| Site address   | Land north of High Street, Ketteringham  |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated  |
| Planning History   | 1988/2404 Erection Of Six Dwellings On Former Paddock. Refused<br>2001/2085 Erection of cottage style dwelling. Refused<br>2017/1572 Phased Outline Application for erection of 3 self build/custom built two storey dwellings and garages and access (with some matters reserved). Approved<br>2018/0991 Reserved Matters application following 2017/1572/F - Erection of 3 dwellings for appearance, landscaping and layout. Approved. Works commenced |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)                                      | 0.55ha   |
| Promoted Site Use, including<br>(c) Allocated site<br>(d) SL extension | Allocated Site   |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Assume 25dph   |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield   | Greenfield   |

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

|                                |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Scheduled Ancient Monument     | No |
| Locally Designated Green Space | No |

### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

| SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT |                       |   |                      |
|------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Constraint             | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
| Access to the site     | Green                 | <p>Access for 3 dwellings considered acceptable under the recent planning permission.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber</b><br/>Sufficient frontage available to provide required visibility with carriageway widening to 5.5m and 2.0m wide footway at frontage. No walking route to catchment school. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision.</p> | Amber                |

|   |                              |   |                             |
|---|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul><br><i>Part 2:</i><br>Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul> | Amber                        | No village Shop<br><br>Bus stop within 1.90km at Old Hall School Hethersett and is on the bus route for Konectbus 6<br><br>Hethersett Junior and Academy are 2.84km<br><br>No footpaths |                             |
|   |                              | Village Hall opposite<br><br>Recreational ground 3.50km<br><br>Range of services in Hethersett 3km<br><br>Ketteringham Hall complex with Orchard Nursery School, tea rooms etc 1.35km   | Amber                       |
| Utilities Capacity  | Amber                        | Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed  | Amber                       |
| Utilities Infrastructure  | Green                        | Promoter advises water and electricity available to site. Individual treatment plants agreed for the 3 dwellings which go into a mounded filter system                                  | Green                       |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk  |                              | The site is within an area already served by fibre technology   | Green                       |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route   |                              | Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location  | Green                       |
| Contamination & ground stability  | Green                        | The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.  | Green                       |
| Flood Risk  | Green                        | Flood zone 1  | Green                       |
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
| SN Landscape Type<br><i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>   |                              | Rural River Valley  |                             |
|   |                              | Tributary Farmland  |                             |
|   |                              | Tributary Farmland with Parkland  |                             |
|   |                              | Settled Plateau Farmland  | X                           |

|  |       |  |             |
|--|-------|--|-------------|
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) |       | Plateau Farmland   |             |
|  |       | Valley Urban Fringe  |             |
|  |       | Fringe Farmland  |             |
|  |       | D1 - Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland  |             |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                     | Green | Given the consented development the proposal would detrimental impact on landscape which may be reasonably mitigated.  | Green/Amber |
| Townscape  | Green | The limitations of drainage meaning that only a drainage mound is suitable for the site. This, therefore, limits the density of site development from the outset - hence three houses is a maximum on current indications of size of the units | Amber       |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity                                      | Amber | Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.   | Amber       |
| Historic Environment   | Green | Listed War memorial in front of the adjacent site, listed buildings located to the west and opposite diagonally however given the consented development any harm could be reasonably mitigated<br><br><b>NCC HES- Amber</b>                    | Green/Amber |
| Open Space   | Green | Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space   | Green       |
| Transport and Roads  | Green | The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. However the 3 dwellings were considered acceptable.<br><br><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b>                        | Amber       |
| Neighbouring Land Uses   | Green | Agricultural and residential, railway line and A11 beyond to the north, protected by existing trees  | Green       |

#### Part 4 Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?  | <p>Listed War memorial in front of the adjacent site, listed buildings located to the west and opposite diagonally, however given the consented development any harm could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>A linear development has already been considered acceptable</p>   |                         |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?                                    | <p>Sufficient frontage available to provide required visibility with carriageway widening to 5.5m and 2.0m wide footway at frontage. Access for 3 dwellings considered acceptable under the recent planning permission.</p>  |                         |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Agricultural. Works commenced on the consented development   |                         |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)    | Agricultural and residential, railway line and A11 beyond to the north   |                         |
| 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)  | <p>The site frontage is to High Street which lies to the south of the site with a vegetated site frontage including field maple, oak and ash. There is a row of Leyland cypress situated along the rear, northern boundary, interspersed with aspen and a scots pine in the north-east corner. To the north of the site are open fields. There is an Ash tree situated on the western side of the unmade track which lies to the west of the site beyond which is a parcel of land that was recently refused planning permission for 3 self-build bungalows under 2017/0413.</p> |                         |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.  |                         |

|  |  |           |
|--|--|-----------|
| Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)                             | No   |           |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | Site clearly visible from the road.  |           |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | The application site is a flat rectangular shaped parcel of land. The site frontage is to High Street which lies to the south of the site with a vegetated site frontage including filed maple, oak and ash. There is a row of Leyland cypress situated along the rear, northern boundary, interspersed with aspen and a scots pine in the north-east corner. To the north of the site are open fields. There is an Ash tree situated on the western side of the unmade track which lies to the west of the site beyond which is a parcel of land that was recently refused planning permission for 3 self-build bungalows under 2017/0413. To the east of the site is a neighbouring residential dwelling which forms a line of 8 detached and semi-detached dwellings. A denser development would harm the setting of the village and the townscape. | Amber/Red |



## Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations ( <i>UNIFORM</i> ) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Open Countryside                           |   |                      |
|  |   |                      |
|  |   |                      |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                          | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green                |

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)   |                |   |                      |
|--|----------------|---|----------------------|
|  | Comments       |   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?  | Private        |   |                      |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br><i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | No             |   |                      |
| When might the site be available for development?<br><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?<br><i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | Statement from promoter advising same | Green              |

|  |  |       |
|--|--|-------|
|  |  |       |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated?<br><i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i> | Likely off-site highway improvements. NCC to confirm | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?                 | Statement from promoter advising same                | Green |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?   | No   |       |

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** Not considered suitable for further development due to potential adverse impacts on due to potential adverse impacts on Townscape and Landscape

**Site Visit Observations** The application site is a flat rectangular shaped parcel of land. The site frontage is to High Street which lies to the south of the site with a vegetated site frontage including filed maple, oak and ash. There is a row of Leyland cypress situated along the rear, northern boundary, interspersed with aspen and a scots pine in the north-east corner. To the north of the site are open fields. There is an Ash tree situated on the western side of the unmade track which lies to the west of the site beyond which is a parcel of land that was recently refused planning permission for 3 self-build bungalows under 2017/0413. To the east of the site is a neighbouring residential dwelling which forms a line of 8 detached and semi-detached dwellings. A denser development would harm the setting of the village and the townscape.

**Local Plan Designations** Within open countryside

**Availability** Promoter has advised availability immediately

**Achievability** No additional constraints identified

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. The site is part of a smaller group of dwellings located north off The Street, also separated from the existing Settlement Limit. Site potentially suitable size for a settlement limit extension, although the site does not immediately adjoin the current settlement limit in this location. The site is also constrained by heritage setting (Listed War memorial in front of the adjacent site) and landscape impact. Site is also at the limits of accessibility to services in terms of distance, a problem which is exacerbated by the lack of footways.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 7/01/2021

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

### Part 1 Site Details

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Site Reference   | SN0528   |
| Site address   | High street, Ketteringham  |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated  |
| Planning History   | <p>1980/3524 - 2 Stables and Tack Room and Adjoining 3 Hay Stores. Approved</p> <p>1981/1854 - Erection of Loose Box Range For Horses (Application To Relax 'Temporary' Condition). Approved</p> <p>1986/1035 - Residential Development. Refused</p> <p>1989/1027 - Erection Of 3 Or 4 Dwellings. Refused</p> <p>2015/0075 - Use of land for equine and residential purposes, including a concrete pad for standing one residential caravan, erection of day room, and retention of existing. Refused. Appeal Dismissed.</p> <p>2016/2134 - Development of three bungalows (Phased development). Refused</p> <p>2017/0413 - Development of three self-build bungalows (phased development). Refused. Appeal Dismissed.</p> <p>2018/2841 - Erection of 1 dwelling with associated parking and landscaping. Refused. Appeal Dismissed.</p> |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)                                      | 1.83ha   |
| Promoted Site Use, including<br>(e) Allocated site<br>(f) SL extension | Allocated Site   |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 1 – 10 houses – assume 25dph   |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield   | Greenfield   |

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:

SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar

No

|                                |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
|                                |    |
| National Nature Reserve        | No |
| Ancient Woodland               | No |
| Flood Risk Zone 3b             | No |
| Scheduled Ancient Monument     | No |
| Locally Designated Green Space | No |

### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

| SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT |                       |   |                      |
|------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Constraint             | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
| Access to the site     | Green                 | <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber</b><br>It may be possible to provide acceptable visibility with access at High Street, would require widening and f/w to High St frontage and junction improvement at High Ash Road, frontage hedge would require removal. No safe walking route to catchment school. | Amber                |

|  |                              |   |                             |
|--|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i><br>○ Primary School<br>○ Secondary school<br>○ Local healthcare services<br>○ Retail services<br>○ Local employment opportunities<br>○ Peak-time public transport<br><br><i>Part 2:</i><br>Part 1 facilities, plus<br>○ Village/ community hall<br>○ Public house/ cafe<br>○ Preschool facilities<br>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | Amber                        | No village Shop<br><br>Bus stop within 1.90km at Old Hall School Hetherset and is on the bus route for Konectbus 6<br><br>Hetherset Junior and Academy are 2.76km<br><br>No footpaths |                             |
|  |                              | Village Hall opposite<br><br>Recreational ground 3.46km<br><br>Range of services in Hetherset 3km<br><br>Ketteringham Hall complex with Orchard Nursery School, tea rooms etc 1.35km  | Green                       |
| Utilities Capacity   | Amber                        | Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed  | Amber                       |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                        | Promoter advises water, electricity available to the site. Planning application proposed sewage treatment plants  | Green                       |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk   |                              | The site is within an area already served by fibre technology   | Green                       |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route  |                              | Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location  | Green                       |
| Contamination & ground stability   | Green                        | The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.  | Green                       |
| Flood Risk   | Green                        | Surface Water Flood depth 1:000 running along the road to the site frontage and public footpath to the east but not on the site.  | Green                       |
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
| SN Landscape Type<br>(Land Use Consultants 2001)   |                              | Rural River Valley  |                             |
|  |                              | Tributary Farmland  |                             |
|  |                              | Tributary Farmland with Parkland  |                             |
|  |                              | Settled Plateau Farmland  | X                           |

|  |       |   |       |
|--|-------|---|-------|
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) |       | Plateau Farmland  |       |
|  |       | Valley Urban Fringe   |       |
|  |       | Fringe Farmland   |       |
|  |       | DI – Wymondham settled Plateau Farmland   |       |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                     | Green | <p>The site lies within the D1: Wymondham settled plateau farmland where the landscape is described in the South Norfolk Place Making Guide as being composed of 'large expanse of flat landform with little variation over long distances with strong open horizons' with 'vernacular character partly eroded by modern estate type development'. The character area includes more recent infrastructure and the guide refers to the A11 as 'cutting across the plateau and introduces an element of noise and movement into the landscape resulting in marginalised land in the corridor.' Outside the more built up areas, the general grain and pattern comprises of widely dispersed individual dwellings and farm buildings of mixed character set in an arable landscape context.</p> <p>Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated.</p> | Amber |

|                             |       |   |           |
|-----------------------------|-------|---|-----------|
| Townscape                   | Green | <p>Ketteringham is a small village which lies to the south of the new A11 and the Norwich-Ely railway line. The village has developed in a linear form along The Street and Low Road. The narrow lane, hedgerows and trees, together with agricultural activity, creates a very rural feel.</p> <p>Ketteringham is a linear settlement with the pattern of development being characterised by dwellings fronting on to High Street. The Planning Inspector for the single dwelling commented ‘ I consider that the artificial subdivision of the site would erode the importance of this gap which contributes positively to the open nature and rural character of the area. This would lead to an uncharacteristic interruption of this gap and lead to a built form and suburbanisation that would be at odds with the open quality of the area.’</p> <p>Adjacent the development boundary.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could not be reasonably mitigated.</p> | Amber/Red |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.  | Amber     |
| Historic Environment        | Amber | <p>Grade 11 listed war memorial located to the site’s frontage. The Planning Inspector considered that the development of the site would fail to preserve or enhance the setting, and thereby the significance of, the designated heritage asset.</p> <p><b>NCC HES -Amber</b></p>  | Red       |



|                        |       |  |       |
|------------------------|-------|--|-------|
| Open Space             | Green | Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space   | Green |
| Transport and Roads    | Amber | <b>NCC HIGHWAYS - Red</b><br>The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. | Amber |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green | Agricultural/residential and to the north is a railway line and beyond that is the A11 dual carriageway  | Amber |

#### Part 4 Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?  | The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape and the historic environment which cannot be reasonably mitigated.   |                         |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?  | It may be possible to provide acceptable visibility with access at High Street, would require widening and f/w to High Street frontage and junction improvement at High Ash Road, frontage hedge would require removal.   |                         |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Agricultural/keeping of horses  |                         |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)  | Agricultural/residential and to the north is a railway line and beyond that is the A11 dual carriageway. Potential adverse impact from the noise from the railway.  |                         |
| 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)  | The site is a field which is accessed from High Street. To the south and west are a number of residential properties. To the north is a railway line and beyond that is the A11 dual carriageway. To the east is agricultural land and beyond that there are further residential properties. The site is opposite the Village Hall and there is also a War memorial adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. A public right of way runs north-south adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. |                         |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?   | Ditch to road frontage, tree and hedgerow to the rear (northern boundary). Original hedgerow removed to the road boundary.  |                         |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | None  |                         |

|  |   |     |
|--|---|-----|
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | Public right of way runs along the eastern boundary. Site visible from the road and public foot path. Will be visible in wider views.   |     |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | <p>The site is a field which is accessed from High Street. To the south and west are a number of residential properties. To the north is a railway line and beyond that is the A11 dual carriageway. To the east is agricultural land and beyond that there are further residential properties. The site is opposite the Village Hall and there is also a War memorial adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. A public right of way runs north-south adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site.</p> <p>Ketteringham is a linear settlement with the pattern of development being characterised by dwellings fronting on to High Street. The Planning Inspector for the single dwelling commented ‘ I consider that the artificial subdivision of the site would erode the importance of this gap which contributes positively to the open nature and rural character of the area. This would lead to an uncharacteristic interruption of this gap and lead to a built form and suburbanisation that would be at odds with the open quality of the area.’</p> | Red |

## Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations ( <i>UNIFORM</i> ) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Open Countryside                           |   |                      |
|  |   |                      |
|  |   |                      |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                          | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green                |

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)   |                |                      |
|--|----------------|----------------------|
|  | Comments       | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?  | Private        |                      |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br><i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | No             |                      |
| When might the site be available for development?<br><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?<br><i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | Statement from promoter advising same | Green              |

|  |  |       |
|--|--|-------|
|  |  |       |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated?<br><i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i> | Likely off-site highway improvements. NCC to confirm | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?                 | Statement from promoter advising same                | Green |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?   | None   |       |

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** Not considered suitable, due to adverse impacts on Heritage assets and landscape/townscape.

**Site Visit Observations** The site is a field which is accessed from High Street. To the south and west are a number of residential properties. To the north is a railway line and beyond that is the A11 dual carriageway. To the east is agricultural land and beyond that there are further residential properties. The site is opposite the Village Hall and there is also a War memorial adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. A public right of way runs north-south adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site.

**Local lan Designations** Within open countryside and adjacent to development boundary

**Availability** Promoter has advised availability within 5 years

**Achievability** No additional constraints identified

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. The site is constrained by heritage impacts, access and landscape. There is a Grade II listed war memorial located to the site's frontage where a Planning Inspector has considered that the development of the site would fail to preserve or enhance the setting, and thereby the significance of, the designated heritage asset. Whilst the site is adjacent to the existing Settlement Limit and within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities, this does not outweigh the limitations of the site in highways terms. The site also provides an attractive rural setting with open views to the north and north east, where development could lead to an uncharacteristic interruption.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 07/01/2021

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

**Part 1 Site Details**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Site Reference</b>   | SN3031  |
| <b>Site address</b>   | Land at Cantley lane Ketteringham   |
| <b>Current planning status<br/>(including previous planning policy status)</b>  | Unallocated   |
| <b>Planning History</b>   | FH\5376\ Use of site for Domestic Dwellings. Refused<br>1977/1025 Detached House with Garage To Serve Horticultural Holding. Refused<br>1978/1850 Erection 1 dwelling. Refused<br>1992/1375 Change of use of land to 9hole pitch and putt course and erection of office. Refused<br>1984/2515 Erection of a dwelling. Refused<br>2000/0404 Erection of a dwelling and garage. Refused |
| <b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>  | 2.96ha  |
| <b>Promoted Site Use, including<br/>(g) Allocated site<br/>(h) SL extension</b> | Allocated Site  |
| <b>Promoted Site Density<br/>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>  | Mixed development – residential/care home<br><br>Assume 25dph   |
| <b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>   | Greenfield  |

**Part 2 Absolute Constraints**

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

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Scheduled Ancient Monument     | Not on the site on the opposite side of the road to the north in 'Big Wood' |
| Locally Designated Green Space | No  |

### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

| SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT   |                       |  |                      |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Constraint   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
| Access to the site   | Red                   | <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b><br>Unlikely to be able to form satisfactory access. Local highway network not of a standard to support development traffic. No safe walking route to catchment school. | Red                  |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> | Red                   | No village Shop<br><br>Thickthorn park and ride 1.05km<br><br>Hethersett Junior and Academy are 3.86km with playing fields beyond<br><br>Cringleford Primary School 2.31km.<br><br>No footpaths  |                      |



|   |                              |   |                             |
|---|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Part 2:<br>Part 1 facilities, plus<br>oVillage/ community hall<br>oPublic house/ cafe<br>o Preschool facilities<br>o Formal sports/ recreation facilities |                              | Village Hall (Cringleford) 2.30km and recreational ground<br><br>Range of services in Cringleford (separated by Thickthorn Roundabout)<br><br>Nellie's nursery 1.55km<br><br>McDonalds, shell garage, Burger King and Thickthorn park and ride 1.05km | Amber                       |
| Utilities Capacity  | Amber                        | Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed<br>AW advise sewers crossing the site  | Amber                       |
| Utilities Infrastructure  | Green                        | Promoter advises water, sewage (?) gas (?) and electricity available to site.   | Green                       |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk  |                              | The site is within an area not served by fibre technology and no planned upgrade  | Red                         |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route   |                              | Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location  | Green                       |
| Contamination & ground stability  | Green                        |   | Green                       |
| Flood Risk  | Red                          | Middle to Northern part of the site in Flood zones 2 and 3a. Surface Water flooding all including flood hazard in same area as the flood zones.   | Red                         |
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
| SN Landscape Type<br>( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )   |                              | Rural River Valley  |                             |
|   |                              | Tributary Farmland  |                             |
|   |                              | Tributary Farmland with Parkland  | X                           |
|   |                              | Settled Plateau Farmland  |                             |
|   |                              | Plateau Farmland  |                             |
|   |                              | Valley Urban Fringe   |                             |
|   |                              | Fringe Farmland   |                             |
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )  |                              | C1 - Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland  |                             |

|                              |       |   |           |
|------------------------------|-------|---|-----------|
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Amber | <p>Within the Strategic gap which looks to retain the openness of the gap and the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone which seeks to retain the openness of the zone and where possible enhance the landscape setting of the southern bypass.</p> <p>Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated</p> | Amber/Red |
| Townscape                    | Green | The site is detached from the main part of the village. The site is currently used as an agricultural within flood zones and with significant trees. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.  | Amber/Red |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity  | green | Development may impact on protected species, which may be reasonably mitigated.   | Amber     |
| Historic Environment         | Amber | <p>Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby Ancient Monuments located to the north/west in 'Big Wood' but could be reasonably mitigated</p> <p><b>NCC HES - Amber</b></p>   | Amber     |
| Open Space                   | Green | Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space  | Green     |
| Transport and Roads          | Amber | <p>Local highway network not of a standard to support development traffic.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b></p>   | Amber     |
| Neighbouring Land Uses       | Amber | Railway line to the south and residential/agricultural  | Amber     |

#### Part 4 Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?  | <p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of Ancient Monuments.</p> <p>The site is detached from the main part of the village. The site is currently used as an agricultural field with significant trees. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.</p> |                         |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?  | Unlikely to be able to form satisfactory access.  |                         |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Agricultural Grade 3  |                         |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)  | Railway line to the south and residential/agricultural  |                         |
| 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)  | Mature trees on the site boundaries, railway line to the south, residential development.  |                         |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?   | Significant trees to the boundaries and hedgerow/trees within the site itself.  |                         |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | Overhead line across the north/west part  |                         |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | Although significant trees to the northern and western boundaries, the site is clearly visible from Cantley Lane  |                         |

|   |  |            |
|---|--|------------|
| <p><b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p> | <p>Not adjacent to the development boundary, remote and separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the east of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network. Within the strategic gap and landscape protection zone and therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate. Within Flood zones 2 and 3a, with surface water drainage flooding and hazard.</p> | <p>Red</p> |
|---|--|------------|

### Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations ( <i>UNIFORM</i> ) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Open Countryside                           |   |                      |
| Strategic gap                              |   |                      |
| Norwich southern bypass protection zone    |   |                      |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                          | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green                |

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)   |                |                      |
|--|----------------|----------------------|
|  | Comments       | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?  | Private        |                      |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br><i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | No             |                      |
| When might the site be available for development?<br><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?<br><i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | Statement from promoter advising same   | Green              |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated?<br><i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>  | Likely off-site highway improvements. NCC to confirm<br><br>Overhead lines to be relocated? | Amber              |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?                  | Statement from promoter advising same   | Green              |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?  | No  |                    |

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** Not considered suitable, due to remote/separation from the main village, no existing development boundary. Potential adverse impacts on Heritage assets, landscape and highway safety. Half of the site within Flood zones 2 and 3a.

**Site Visit Observations** Not adjacent to the development boundary, remote and separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the east of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate. Within Flood zones 2 and 3a, with surface water drainage flooding and hazard.

**Local Plan Designations** Within open countryside, Strategic gap and Norwich Southern Bypass protection Zone.

**Availability** Promoter has advised availability 1 to 5 years

**Achievability** No additional constraints identified

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. The wider site is significantly too large in the context of the Village Clusters document. No smaller parts of the site are considered suitable due to the poor relationship with existing settlement (i.e. detached by intervening fields), and the consequent townscape/landscape concerns. The site is also heavily constrained by flood zone 2 and 3a, which cover over 50% of the site. Impacts on landscape, highways and Heritage assets could not be reasonably mitigated.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 07/01/2021