

Saxlingham Nethergate
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

Contents

| | |
|----------------|----|
| SN0198 | 3 |
| SN4005 | 10 |
| SN4007SL | 18 |
| SN4034SL | 25 |

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference | SN0198 |
| Site address | 6 Kensington Close |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | Historic refusal for single dwelling |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 0.34 ha |
| Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension | SL extension |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Up to 10 dwellings = up to 29 dph (25 dph = 9 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 | Red | No access. Would rely on access through adjacent property. Does not appear possible to create a safe access. NCC Highways – Red. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. Norwich Road in the vicinity of the site lacks footways & there is no safe walking route to school. | 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 | 800m walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 3000m and bus service (including peak) within 1800m | |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Village hall (with groups), recreation ground within 1800m | Amber |
| Utilities Capacity | Green | Wastewater capacity to be confirmed | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter advises electricity, water and foul drainage to site. No UKPN constraints. | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site is within the area 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. No identified 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: N/A | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green | Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design | Amber |
| Townscape | Green | Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network could be reasonably mitigated | Amber |

| | | | |
|------------------------|-------|--|-------|
| Historic Environment | Green | No detrimental impact on HAs HES - 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. NCC Highways – Red. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. Norwich Road in the vicinity of the site lacks footways & there is no safe walking route to 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? | No direct impacts | |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | No existing access and no opportunity to provide this. Promoter relying on access beside existing dwelling | |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Garden/amenity | |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agriculture/ residential – compatible uses | |
| 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 and residential boundaries. | |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Trees along boundary and within site. Assessment required. | |

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | No constraints. No evidence of contamination. | |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Not prominent in views. Screened by existing development and established hedgerow. | |
| 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) | Walking route to school lacks footpath provision although wide verge in places and close to limited local services. Development as promoted would not reflect pattern and density of existing development. No separate access and does not appear feasible to provide. Development would also have significant impact on existing residential amenity. | 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> | No | |
| When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i> | Immediately | X |
| | Within 5 years | |
| | 5 – 10 years | |
| | 10 – 15 years | |
| | 15-20 years | |
| | Comments: | |

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability) | | |
|---|--|--------------------|
| | Comments | Site Score (R/A/G) |
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | Supporting statement from promoter | Amber |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i> | Yes. Currently no separate access to site. | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | No. Not included in supporting statement | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | No | |

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability Not suitable for allocation due to lack of access and impacts on townscape and existing residential amenity.

Site Visit Observations Walking route to school lacks footpath provision although wide verge in places and close to limited local services. Development as promoted would not reflect pattern and density of existing development. No separate access and does not appear feasible to provide. Development would also have significant impact on existing residential amenity.

Local Plan Designations Open countryside

Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability Promoter has not commented

OVERALL CONCLUSION: UNREASONABLE. The site is adjacent to the settlement limit and existing modern residential properties however it is land-locked with no access into it. It would be contained within existing hedge boundaries but would be out of character with the surrounding development and would impact on residential amenity.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 12 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

| | |
|--|--|
| Site Reference | SN4005 |
| Site address | North of Norwich Road |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | No relevant history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 1.1 ha |
| Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension | Allocated site |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 12 dwellings = 11 dph (25 dph = 27 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. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development</p> <p>NCC Highways - Amber. No continuous f/w to village amenities & Norwich Road constrained in places.</p> <p>Highways Meeting - Lack of continuous footpath back to the village. Would not be a safe walking route (alignment of the road is an issue), particularly as the school is located at the opposite end of the village. Highways not supportive.</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 | 1000m walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 3000m and bus service (including peak) within 1800m | |
| | | Village hall (with groups), recreation ground within 1800m | Amber |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Wastewater capacity to be confirmed | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter advises electricity, water and foul drainage to site. No UKPN constraints. | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site is within the area 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. No identified flood risk within site. LFFA – Green. Surface water flooding. | 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 | |

| | | | |
|--|-------|--|-------|
| SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>) | | Fringe Farmland | |
| | | B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3 | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green | Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. SDC Landscape Officer - Development of this site is not acceptable in landscape terms. Considerable hedgerow issues (conflicting with DM4.8) as well as landscape character issues. | Amber |
| Townscape | Green | Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. SDC Heritage Officer - If linear development along road it would have more impact with large new development. Preferable in townscape terms to keep as much of hedge as possible and have a slightly deeper site even with smaller close with one point of access maybe. To the east side to the south there is quite a lot of existing development – with Kensington Close. | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain | Amber |

| | | | |
|------------------------|-------|---|-------|
| Historic Environment | Green | No detrimental impact on HAs SDC Heritage Officer - LBs are quite far to north, and CA to the south, so no real impact – all modern housing nearby. HES - 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. NCC Highways - Red. No continuous f/w to village amenities & Norwich Road constrained in places. Highways Meeting - Lack of continuous footpath back to the village. Would not be a safe walking route (alignment of the road is an issue), particularly as the school is located at the opposite end of the village. Highways not supportive. | 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 | |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Field access at northern end. NCC to confirm feasibility of new access as promoted due to proximity to bend. | |
| 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 – compatible uses | |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Northern part of site raised above adjacent highway. G/L falls to south, in line with highway | |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Hedgerow including trees. Open to farmland to north. | |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Hedgerow and trees along boundary and hedgerow transecting the 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 highway boundary. | |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Prominent in views along Norwich Road and from farmland to north. | |
| 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) | Walking route to school lacks footpath provision although wide verge in places. No opportunity to link into existing footpaths. Townscape and landscape impacts would be limited by development of southern section only with landscaped boundary on north eastern side. Need to reflect existing pattern of development would constrain numbers. Seek early comment regarding access. | 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) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 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> | No | |
| When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i> | Immediately | X |
| | Within 5 years | |
| | 5 – 10 years | |
| | 10 – 15 years | |
| | 15-20 years | |
| | Comments: | |

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability) | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| | Comments | Site Score (R/A/G) |
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | Supporting statement from promoter | Amber |

| | | |
|---|--|-------|
| | | |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | Yes. Currently no separate access to site. | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | No. Not included in supporting statement | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | No | |

Part 7 Conclusion

| CONCLUSION |
|--|
| <p>Suitability Not suitable for allocation as promoted due to lack of connectivity and landscape/townscape impacts. However, development of southern section only could limit these impacts but would not overcome other concerns.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Walking route to school lacks footpath provision although wide verge in places. No opportunity to link into existing footpaths. Townscape and landscape impacts would be limited by development of southern section only with landscaped boundary on north eastern side. Need to reflect existing pattern of development would constrain numbers. Seek early comment regarding access.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Open countryside</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.</p> <p>Achievability Supporting statement submitted</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: UNREASONABLE. The site is adjacent to the settlement limit but there is no continuous footpath back to the village and there would not be a safe walking route. The site is out of scale with the village and would extend into the landscape and wider views to the north, elongating the village. Access from Norwich Road would require the removal of substantial mature hedging.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p> |

Date Completed: 12 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference | SN4007SL |
| Site address | Land south of Norwich Road |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | No relevant history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 0.37 ha |
| Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension | SL extension for affordable housing |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 3 dwellings = 8 dph (25 dph = 9 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 field access. Potential constraints but these could be overcome through development. NCC Highways - Red. Visibility at frontage limited by road layout. No continuous f/w to village amenities & Norwich Road constrained in places. | 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 | 1200 m walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 3000m and bus service (including peak) within 1800m | |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Village hall (with groups), recreation ground within 1800m | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Wastewater capacity to be confirmed | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter advises electricity, water and foul drainage to site. No UKPN constraints. | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Within a proposed fibre installation area | Amber |
| 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. No identified flood risk within site. LFFA – Green. | 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 | Amber | Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design | Amber |
| Townscape | Amber | Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. | Amber |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|--|-------|
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Amber | Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain | Amber |
| Historic Environment | Green | No detrimental impact on HAs HES - 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. NCC Highways - Red. Visibility at frontage limited by road layout. No continuous f/w to village amenities & Norwich Road constrained in places. | 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 | |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Existing field access. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable as site near bend | |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Amenity land | |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agriculture/ residential – compatible uses | |
| 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. Fence to southern boundary. | |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Trees along eastern 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 constraints. No evidence of contamination. | |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Prominent in views along Norwich 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) | Walking route to school lacks footpath provision but wide verges in places. Improved access would require loss of hedgerow. | 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) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Within development boundary | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 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> | No | |
| When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i> | Immediately | X |
| | Within 5 years | |
| | 5 – 10 years | |
| | 10 – 15 years | |
| | 15-20 years | |
| | Comments: | |

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability) | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| | Comments | Site Score (R/A/G) |
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | Supporting statement from promoter | 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 improvements. | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoted for affordable housing only | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | Affordable housing in rural area | |

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability Not suitable for allocation as site is within existing SL. Proposals should be assessed against current DM policies. Access, design/layout and landscaping would be main considerations.

Site Visit Walking route to school lacks footpath provision but wide verges in places. Improved access would require loss of hedgerow

Local Plan Designations Within development boundary

Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability As confirmed by promoter

OVERALL CONCLUSION: NOT REASONABLE FOR ALLOCATION AS SITE ALREADY WITHIN SL. The site is already located within the Settlement Boundary. Proposals would be assessed against current DM policies which already support development here in principle. Access, design, layout and landscaping would be the main considerations to be dealt with through a planning application.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 12 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

| | |
|--|---|
| Site Reference | SN4034SL |
| Site address | Land west of sandpit Lane |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | 2017/0360 single dwelling – refused and dismissed at appeal |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 0.1 ha |
| Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension | SL extension |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Up to 5 dwellings = 50 dph (25 dph = 2.5 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 | Red | Existing access. Potential constraints but these could be overcome through development. NCC Highways - Red. Access & safe walking route not achievable. | 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 | 1400 m walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 3000m and bus service (including peak) within 1800m | |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Village hall (with groups), recreation ground within 1800m | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Green | Wastewater capacity to be confirmed | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter advises electricity, water and foul drainage to site. No UKPN constraints. | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Within a proposed fibre installation area | Amber |
| 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. NCC Minerals - site within the 400m consultation area for safeguarded key Water Recycling Centres. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the mineral and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy. | Green |
| Flood Risk | Green | Flood zone 1. No identified flood risk within site. LFFA – Green. | 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 (<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 | Amber |
| Townscape | Green | Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology – Green. Potential for protected species/ habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain | Amber |
| Historic Environment | Green | No detrimental impact on HAs HES - 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. NCC Highways - Red. Access & safe walking route not achievable. | 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 | |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Existing access onto track off Sandpit Lane which is very narrow, no verge and enclosed by high hedgerow. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable | |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Garden/amenity | |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agriculture/ residential – compatible uses | |
| 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 | |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Trees along boundary and within site. Assessment required. | |
| 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 southern boundary. No evidence of contamination. | |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Not prominent in views. Screened by existing development and established hedgerow. | |
| 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) | Walking route to school lacks footpath provision along very narrow lane with limited visibility. Also impacts on connectivity to other local services which would rely on private car. Development as proposed would not reflect existing scattered pattern of development. | 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) |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 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> | No | | |
| When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i> | Immediately | X | Green |
| | Within 5 years | | |
| | 5 – 10 years | | |
| | 10 – 15 years | | |
| | 15-20 years | | |
| | Comments: | | |

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability) | | |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Comments | Site Score (R/A/G) |
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional</i> | Supporting statement from promoter | 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 | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoted for affordable housing only | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | Affordable housing in rural area | |

Part 7 Conclusion

| CONCLUSION |
|---|
| <p>Suitability Not suitable for extension to settlement limit due to lack of connectivity to school and other local services and townscape impacts.</p> <p>Site Visit Walking route to school lacks footpath provision along very narrow lane with limited visibility. Also impacts on connectivity to other local services which would rely on private car. Development as proposed would not reflect existing scattered pattern of development.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Open countryside</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.</p> <p>Achievability As confirmed by promoter</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: UNREASONABLE. It is detached from the village and remote from the school and other services with poor connectivity along very narrow, single track, unlit roads with no footpaths. The site is visually contained but development here is sporadic and this type of consolidation would be out of character. It would require the removal of established frontage hedging which would significantly add to this impact.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p> |

Date Completed: 12 January 2021