

Seething & Mundham
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

Contents

SN0405	3
SN0406SL	14
SN0587SL	24
SN0588SL	33
SN1035	42
SN2148SL	52

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0405
Site address	Land to North and South of Brooke Road, Seething
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	The 'Cart Shed' site: L/5630 Two dwellings for farm workers. Approved 1978/0535 Two Dwellings Together with Garages and Stores for Farm Workers. Approved 1985/2380 Conversion of Redundant Cart Shed and Store to A Single Dwelling for Private Use. Refused 2004/2367 Proposed conversion of barn to single dwelling. Approved
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.252ha (total of 3 sites) Site North of Brooke Road 0.772ha – 19 dwellings The site 'The Cart Shed' – 7 dwellings The site between Seething and Mundham School and Church Farmhouse will provide additional car parking for the school
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Residential development of approximately 26 dwellings (as well as additional car parking for the adjoining school)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield and part of the barn conversions garden

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)

Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential access constraints existing hedge/trees to site frontage. Potential access could be formed to the land to the north, subject to a frontage footway. Adoptable access unlikely to be achieved to the south area. The road bends and has the school access and other junctions in close proximity</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber, access could be formed to the area north of Brooke Road subject to frontage footway. Adoptable standard access unlikely to be achievable to the area south of Brooke Road. Does not appear feasible to provide footway to nearby school.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting - very tight to get a footway on the School Road/Brooke Road junction (particularly with the pond on the corner). School access is currently arranged to separate vehicles and pedestrians, with vehicle access from Brooke Road and pedestrians from School Road. Likely to need a discussion with both the site promoter and the school about enhanced access arrangements and car parking, maybe accessing the school at the western end. Layout of the road means that speed limit compliance is likely to be good in this location, and a part-time 20mph outside the school may be beneficial.</p>	Amber
--------------------	-------	---	-------

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Village Shop 575m Bus stop within 594m and is on the bus route for Anglian 86 Primary School is within 122m No footpaths	
		Village Hall 604m Recreational ground/play area next to village hall	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	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 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	Amber	Flood zone 1 with surface water flooding depth of 1-1000 in the road and around the pond	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Landscape Meeting - Particular concerns about the infilling of the 'Old Park' site as this would represent significant infill which could have a townscape impact. Consider this to be a difficult site however further consideration of this site is required.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Amber	<p>The sites are located in a distinctly rural part of the District on the edge of Seething. Existing buildings in the wider context are of mixed architectural character incorporating a range of materials and styles, with village ponds also a feature. The grain in Seething is generally quite spacious especially the more peripheral areas and vegetation remains quite dominant along the streets, and relatively few buildings are located close to the back of the street except more toward the centre, but even there hedgerows are a key feature.</p> <p>The cart shed site is located within/adjacent to a farm complex and the land to the north of the is located adjacent to a linear form of development to the east and an estate to the west.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. The land north of Brooke Road is adjacent to the development boundary to the southeast.</p>	Amber

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB. St Margaret's Church is located to the east of School lane. Separated from the two housing sites by intervening land uses. Seething Old hall and Church Monument are located to the northwest of the 'land to north of Brooke Road' with the Seething Old Hall Park development between. The Cart Shed site is located within the Seething Conservation Area. The 'land to north of Brooke Road' is partly within and as is small part of the land proposed for parking.</p> <p>HES - Amber</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>Potential impact on functioning of road network which may not be reasonably mitigated. Narrow carriage way and no footway</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, access could be formed to the area north of Brooke Road subject to frontage footway. Adoptable standard access unlikely to be achievable to the area south of Brooke Road. Does not appear feasible to provide footway to nearby school.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting - very tight to get a footway on the School Road/Brooke Road junction (particularly with the pond on the corner). School access is currently arranged to separate vehicles and pedestrians, with vehicle access from Brooke Road and pedestrians from School Road. Likely to need a discussion with both the site promoter and the school about enhanced access arrangements and car parking, maybe accessing the school at the western end. Layout of the road means that speed limit compliance is likely to be good in this location, and a part-time 20mph outside the school may be beneficial.</p>	<p>Red</p> <p>Amber</p>
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential and Seething and Mundham Primary School	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB's.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. The land north of Brooke Road is adjacent to the development boundary to the southeast.</p>	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	<p>Potential access constraints existing hedge/trees to site frontage.</p> <p>Potential access could be formed to the land to the north, subject to a frontage footway. Adoptable access unlikely to be achieved to the south area. The road bends and has the school access and other junctions in close proximity.</p>	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	<p>Part of the Cart Shed site is domestic curtilage to the barn conversion granted consent in 2004.</p> <p>Agricultural grade 3</p>	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	<p>Agricultural/residential and Seething and Mundham Primary School</p>	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	<p>Flat</p>	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	<p>Trees/hedgerows. Residential.</p>	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	<p>Possibly significant trees. As land to north of Brooke Road is agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations.</p> <p>Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be 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	Sites are visible from the road network, The Cart Shed is clearly viewed across the open landscape. The land to the north is better screened. Public footpath runs east west to the south of Church Farmhouse from in front of the school	
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)	Land to north is adjacent the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated. Views of the sites are afforded from both the surrounding road network and the and public footpath. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.	Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside		
Conclusion	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? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <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?	Yes - the provision of a car park for the school	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The land to the north of Brooke Road is considered suitable subject to mitigation of constraints and confirmation from NCC Highways that the site is acceptable in highway terms and the heritage officer that the development would not harm the heritage assets, in particular views of the Church and listed building and monument.

Site Visit Observations Land to north is adjacent the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated. Views of the sites are afforded from both the surrounding road network and the and public footpath. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

Local Plan Designations Within open countryside and adjacent to development boundary in part.

Availability Promoter has advised availability within 5 years

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Three parcels of land have been promoted in this location. Of these two sites are preferred for allocation:

- (1) The land to the north of Brooke Road is considered reasonable subject to mitigation of the constraints particularly the highway impacts, impacts on the existing hedgerow/trees, landscape considerations and heritage terms; and,
- (2) Discussion needs to be undertaken with the school as to whether land between the school and the Church Farm buildings could provide (a) additional car-parking and/or (b) an alternative pedestrian access to the school.

The third parcel of land, 'the cart shed', immediately north of Church Farmhouse is not considered suitable for allocation as this forms part of the setting of a notable non-designated heritage asset within the Conservation Area, contributing significantly to this rural approach to the village.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 4 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0406SL
Site address	Land to West of Seething Street, Seething
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	L/4745 Residential development. Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.46ha (1.169ha across 3 sites)
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Settlement extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Residential development of approximately 29 dwellings across 3 sites - 25dph (GNLP assessment suggests 12 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential access constraints existing hedge/trees to site frontage. Visibility unlikely onto Seething Road, will require removal of front hedge and access will require removal of mature trees.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, visibility unlikely onto Seething Road. Visibility would require the complete removal of the frontage hedge and to provide an access road would require removal of mature trees. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision. No footway to the village school.</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - small infill frontage development would not raise concerns (SN0588SL already has permission for similar)</p>	<p>Red</p> <p>Amber</p>

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> o Primary School o Secondary school o Local healthcare services o Retail services o Local employment opportunities o Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus o Village/ community hall o Public house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Village Shop 305m Bus stop within 1.03km and is on the bus route for Anglian 86 Primary School is within 724m No footpaths	
		Village Hall 538m Recreational ground/play area next to village hall	Green
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	Amber	Flood zone 1 with surface water flooding depth of 1-100 between the pond and the road and 1-1000 covering the northeast corner of the site.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Fringe Farmland	
		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated. Development would require the removal of exiting trees which are protected by virtue of their location within the conservation area.</p> <p>Landscape meeting - There are mature trees on the site and along the site frontage. A tree survey would be required to assess these and determine the quantum of acceptable development on the site however it may be acceptable for 1/2 dwellings.</p>	Amber

Townscape	Amber	<p>The site is located in a distinctly rural part of the District on the edge of Seething. Existing buildings in the wider context are of mixed architectural character incorporating a range of materials and styles, with village ponds also a feature. The grain in Seething is generally quite spacious especially the more peripheral areas and vegetation remains quite dominant along the streets, and relatively few buildings are located close to the back of the street except more toward the centre, but even there hedgerows are a key feature. This part is characterised by a linear form of development.</p> <p>Development boundary is located to the east on the opposite site of the road.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. Especially given it is within the Conservation Area.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Development could have detrimental impact on Seething Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings. The Walnuts and Breydon Cottage are located to the southeast separated by existing residential properties and the road. Mere Thatched Barn is located to the north separated by Mere Farm</p> <p>HES - Amber</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>Potential impact on functioning of the road network may not be reasonably mitigated. Narrow carriage way and no footway</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, visibility unlikely onto Seething Road. Visibility would require the complete removal of the frontage hedge and to provide an access road would require removal of mature trees. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision. No footway to the village school.</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - small infill frontage development would not raise concerns (SN0588SL already has permission for similar)</p>	<p>Red</p> <p>Amber</p>
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB's and Conservation area.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. Especially given it is within the Conservation Area.</p>	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints as there are existing hedge/trees to site frontage.	
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)	Agricultural and residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees/hedgerows to east and west. Residential to the south and north.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant tree at top northeast corner. Trees within the site and on southern and western boundaries. As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations. 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)	Overhead lines run along the road boundary	

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 residential development bounding the site to the south and north and existing hedges/trees screen the site from the road. However, the development would be visible across the open landscape.	
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)	Opposite the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated. The site is limited in its developable area due to the surface water flooding and pond on the site.	Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside		
Conclusion	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? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Likely off-site highway improvements. NCC to confirm Likely surface Water flooding mitigation, plus pond within the site.	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 considered suitable for a settlement extension subject to mitigation of constraints and confirmation from NCC Highways, Landscape Architect and Heritage officer that the site is acceptable in highway, impact on existing hedgerow/trees, and heritage terms. But for a linear type of development.

Site Visit Observations Opposite the development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated. The site is limited in its developable area due to the surface water flooding and pond on the site

Local Plan Designations Within open countryside.

Availability Promoter has advised availability within 5 years

Achievability No additional constraints identified other than the overhead lines which run along the road boundary

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Reasonable – Land to the west of Seething Road does not currently have a Settlement Limit south of Pear Tree House. South of Mere Farm three small Settlement Limit extension sites have been proposed, SN0406SL, SN0587SL and SN0588SL, the latter now has permission for two dwellings.

SN0406SL is considered reasonable for a settlement extension, to accommodate a linear type of development, subject to mitigation of constraints in highway, impact on existing hedgerow/trees, and heritage terms. Given the on-site constraints, this may be limited to 1 or 2 dwellings. In combination with SN0587SL and SN0588SL, this would require a new section of Settlement Limit on the west side of Seething Road, from Mere Farm to The Cottage.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 4 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0587SL
Site address	Land to West of Seething Street, Seething
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	L/4746 Residential development. Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.36ha (1.169ha across 3 sites)
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Settlement extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Residential development of approximately 29 dwellings across 3 sites - 25dph (GNLP assessment suggests 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	<p>Visibility likely to be achievable but may require the removal of an existing mature tree. Access likely to require carriageway widening across the site frontage and frontage footway</p> <p>NCC Highways - Amber, visibility likely to be achievable but may require the removal of an existing mature tree. Access likely to require carriageway widening across the site frontage and frontage footway. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision. No footway to the village school.</p>	Amber

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Village Shop 488m Bus stop within 1.18km and is on the bus route for Anglian 86 Primary School is within 873m No footpaths	
		Village Hall 685m Recreational ground/play area next to village hall	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains 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	Amber	Flood Zone 1. Surface Water Flood Hazard and Surface water Flooding depth 1-100 and 1-30 around the pond. Surface Water Flood depth 1-1000 in the centre of the site	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated unless with a lower density.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	<p>The site is located in a distinctly rural part of the District on the edge of Seething. Existing buildings in the wider context are of mixed architectural character incorporating a range of materials and styles, with village ponds also a feature. The grain in Seething is generally quite spacious especially the more peripheral areas and vegetation remains quite dominant along the streets, and relatively few buildings are located close to the back of the street except more toward the centre, but even there hedgerows are a key feature. This part is characterised by a linear form of development.</p> <p>Development boundary is located on the opposite side of the road to the east.</p> <p>Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site Especially being adjacent to the Conservation Area.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber

Historic Environment	Green	<p>Development could have detrimental impact on Seething Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings. Adjacent to Seething Conservation Area to the east and separated by existing residential properties to the north. The Walnuts and Breydon Cottage two listed buildings are located to the east separated by the road. Therefore the development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB's but could be reasonably mitigated. Careful consideration required to the views into the Conservation Area.</p> <p>HES - Amber</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>Potential impact on functioning of road network may not be reasonably mitigated. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Red, visibility likely to be achievable but may require the removal of an existing mature tree. Access likely to require carriageway widening across the site frontage and frontage footway. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision. No footway to the village school.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB's and Conservation Area.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. Especially given it is adjacent to the Conservation Area.</p>	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints as there are existing hedge/trees to site frontage.	
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)	Agricultural and residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge/trees to frontage – east. Trees/hedges to west. Pond to south and residential property. Residential property to north. Public footpath to the south.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant tree along eastern boundary. As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations. Pond to the south. 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)	Overhead line running along road boundary	

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 residential development bounding the site to the south and north and existing hedges/trees screen the site from the road. However, the development would be visible across the open landscape.	
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)	Opposite the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated.	Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside		
Conclusion	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? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <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 considered suitable for a settlement extension subject to mitigation of constraints and confirmation from NCC Highways, Landscape Architect and Heritage officer that the site is acceptable in highway, impact on existing hedgerow/trees, and heritage terms. But for a linear type of development.

Site Visit Observations Opposite the development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated.

Local Plan Designations Within open countryside

Availability Promoter has advised availability within 5 years

Achievability No additional constraints identified other than the overhead lines which run along the road boundary

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Reasonable – Land to the west of Seething Road does not currently have a Settlement Limit south of Pear Tree House. South of Mere Farm three small Settlement Limit extension sites have been proposed, SN0406SL, SN0587SL and SN0588SL, the latter now has permission for two dwellings.

SN0587SL is considered reasonable for a settlement extension, to accommodate a linear type of development (approx. 5 properties), subject to mitigation of constraints on the highway, the impact on existing hedgerows/trees, and heritage terms. In combination with SN0406SL and SN0588SL, this would require a new section of Settlement Limit on the west side of Seething Road, from Mere Farm to The Cottage.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 4 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0588SL
Site address	Land to West of Seething Street, Seething
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	1977/0008 Construction of a bungalow. Refused 2004/0137 Erection of two new 4 bedroom detached houses and double garages. Refused 2012/1563 Outline for 2 new houses. Refused 2017/1442 2 new detached dwellings with attached single garages. Refused 2018/1033 2 new detached dwellings with single garages. Approved 2019/2352 New house and bungalow with garaging (revised application from 2018/1033). Approved 2020/0870 Variation of condition 2 of 2019/2352 - change design of both plots and submission of materials for each plot. Approved
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.31ha (1.169ha across 3 sites)
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Settlement extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Residential development of approximately 29 dwellings across 3 sites - 25dph (GNLP assessment suggests 8 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)
	Amber	<p>Visibility unachievable onto Seething Road. Provision of an access would require the complete removal of the frontage hedge and to provide an access road would require removal of mature trees.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, visibility unachievable onto Seething Road. Provision of an access would require the complete removal of the frontage hedge and to provide an access road would require removal of mature trees. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision. No footway to the village school.</p>	Red

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> o Primary School o Secondary school o Local healthcare services o Retail services o Local employment opportunities o Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus o Village/ community hall o Public house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Village Shop 617m Bus stop within 1.3km and is on the bus route for Anglian 86 Primary School is within 990m No footpaths	
		Village Hall 818m Recreational ground/play area next to village hall	Green
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.	
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>)		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development for more than approved would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated. Development would require the removal of hedge.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	<p>The site is located in a distinctly rural part of the District on the edge of Seething. Existing buildings in the wider context are of mixed architectural character incorporating a range of materials and styles, with village ponds also a feature. The grain in Seething is generally quite spacious especially the more peripheral areas and vegetation remains quite dominant along the streets, and relatively few buildings are located close to the back of the street except more toward the centre, but even there hedgerows are a key feature. This part is characterised by a linear form of development.</p> <p>The development boundary is located to the east on the opposite side of the road.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could not be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. The site appropriate development of two plots has already been granted planning permission.</p>	Amber/Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber

Historic Environment	Green	<p>Development could have detrimental impact on Seething Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings which could be reasonably mitigated. Outside the Conservation area separated by existing land uses. Breydon Cottage and The Walnuts two listed buildings are located to the northeast separated by intervening land uses.</p> <p>HES - Amber</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>Potential impact on functioning of the road network may not be reasonably mitigated. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, visibility unachievable onto Seething Road. Provision of an access would require the complete removal of the frontage hedge and to provide an access road would require removal of mature trees. Seething Road varies in width and lacks footway provision. No footway to the village school.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB's and Conservation area. The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could not be reasonably mitigated.	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Potential access constraints , above the two dwellings that have been granted in visibility terms.	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Was Agricultural Grade 3 but commencement on site to implement the two consented dwellings	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Agricultural and residential	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Trees/hedgerows to west, part of hedgerow to east removed for consented development. Residential to the south and north.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.	
<i>Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)</i>	Overhead lines run along the road boundary	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Views into the site are limited due to existing residential development bounding the site to the south and north and existing hedges/trees. As the development has commenced the existing hedgerow has been removed opening the site for views from the road.	

Initial site visit conclusion <i>(NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</i>	Opposite the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village, the planning permission for two dwellings has been implemented and 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		
Conclusion	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? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <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 setting of the village and Townscape and highway safety

Site Visit Observations Opposite the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village, the planning permission for two dwellings has been implemented and a denser development would harm the setting of the village and the townscape.

Local Plan Designations Within open countryside.

Availability Promoter has advised availability within 5 years

Achievability No additional constraints identified other than the overhead lines which run along the road boundary

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Reasonable – Land to the west of Seething Road does not currently have a Settlement Limit south of Pear Tree House. South of Mere Farm three small Settlement Limit extension sites have been proposed, SN0406SL, SN0587SL and SN0588SL, the latter now has permission for two dwellings. Whilst SN0588SL raises some concerns in terms of impact on the rural setting of the village, as the site has permission and the CIL commencement has been paid, it is considered reasonable to include. In combination with SN0406SL and SN0587SL, this would require a new section of Settlement Limit on the west side of Seething Road, from Mere Farm to The Cottage.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 4 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN1035
Site address	Land South of Wheelers Lane, Seething
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	<p>2017/2220 Variation of condition 2 of permission 2016/2882 (Proposed 3 no. new dwellings and garages) - Changes to external elevations to plots 1, 2 and 3 and revisions to garages. Approved</p> <p>2017/0749 Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2016/2882/F - Alteration to external elevations for plot 1 and plot 3. Approved</p> <p>2016/2882 Proposed 3 new dwellings and garages. Approved</p> <p>2013/1193 Demolition of existing industrial units and erection of 3 detached houses and associated works. Approved</p> <p>2006/0456 Stopping up of car repair use, removal of caravan and erection of eight affordable houses and five private market houses, associated landscaping, access and car parking. Refused</p> <p>2004/2451 Stopping up of all car repair use, removal of caravan and erection of 6no residential dwellings and 4no affordable dwellings with recreational areas, associated landscaping, car parking and access. Refused</p> <p>2004/0331 Stopping all car repair & breaking use, removal of residential caravan and erection of 8no private dwellings & 4no affordable dwellings with creation of 2no ponds, parking area & landscape. Refused</p> <p>2003/0932 Stopping up of existing lawful car repair use and erection of 6no residential dwellings with recreational meadow & nature reserve. Refused</p> <p>2002/1858 Erection of 12 two and three bedroomed houses and associated landscaped area. Refused</p> <p>L/1289 Erection of five dwellings. Refused</p>
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.87ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Residential development of unspecified number - 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)

Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access visibility restricted by the alignment of the carriageway and adjacent land. Would require complete removal of frontage hedge and trees. Wheeler Lane is narrow, has restricted visibility back onto Seething Road.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, access visibility restricted by the alignment of the carriageway and adjacent land. Would require complete removal of frontage hedge and trees. Wheeler Lane is narrow, has restricted visibility back onto Seething Road and has no footway.</p>	Red
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	Amber	<p>Village Shop 344m</p> <p>Bus stop within 820m and is on the bus route for Anglian 86</p> <p>Primary School is within 500m</p> <p>No footpaths</p>	
		<p>Village Hall next to the site</p> <p>Recreational ground/play area next to village hall</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site. Adjacent site used a package treatment plant. So question if the site has mains sewage and this could have cost implications/viability	Amber/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. It did not form part of the Wheelers garage site.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1. Surface water flooding 1-1000 to the south, outside the promoted 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>)		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated.	Amber

Townscape	Green	<p>The site is located in a distinctly rural part of the District on the edge of Seething. Existing buildings in the wider context are of mixed architectural character incorporating a range of materials and styles, with village ponds also a feature. The grain in Seething is generally quite spacious especially the more peripheral areas and vegetation remains quite dominant along the streets, and relatively few buildings are located close to the back of the street except more toward the centre, but even there hedgerows are a key feature. This part is characterised by a linear form of development.</p> <p>Not adjacent to the development boundary.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. Especially given it is adjacent to the Conservation Area.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby group of listed buildings White Lodge, Mere House, Mereside barn and Mere Thatched barn are located to the southeast separated by agricultural fields. Site is adjacent to Seething Conservation area. The development of the site could adversely affect the views into the Conservation Area, which may not be reasonable mitigated.</p> <p>HES - Amber</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>Potential impact on functioning of road network may not be reasonably mitigated. Narrow carriage way and no footway. Under the adjoining site development NCC Highway could not support more than 3 dwellings due to the nature of the road and surrounding network, the existing traffic associated with Wheelers garage was taken into account.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, access visibility restricted by the alignment of the carriageway and adjacent land. Would require complete removal of frontage hedge and trees. Wheeler Lane is narrow, has restricted visibility back onto Seething Road and has no footway.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential and village hall/playpark	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB's and Conservation area.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. Especially given it is adjacent to the Conservation Area</p>	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access visibility restricted by the alignment of the carriageway and adjacent land. Would require complete removal of frontage hedge and trees. Wheeler Lane is narrow, has restricted visibility back onto Seething Road.	
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)	Agricultural/residential and village hall/playpark	
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)	Residential boundary to the west. Trees/hedges though sparse to the east. Substantial tree to the northeast.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant tree along the northern. As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations. 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)	Overhead line and telegraph poles on site frontage.	

Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are clear views of the site across the open landscape and from the road network.	
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)	Outside the development boundary but well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village. The site is adjacent to the built environment. Views of the site are afforded from both the highway networks and across the open landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.	Red/Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside		
Conclusion	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? <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>	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Likely off-site highway improvements. NCC to confirm No mains sewage so alternatives could affect the viability of the site depending on numbers	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 potential adverse impacts on landscape and highway safety

Site Visit Observations Outside the development boundary but well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village. The site is adjacent to the built environment. Views of the site are afforded from both the highway networks and across the open landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

Local Plan Designations Open Countryside.

Availability Promoter has advised availability immediately

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Unreasonable – Although located close to the centre of the village, the site is not considered reasonable principally due to the poor highway network, with visibility restricted by narrowness and alignment, and also at the junction with Seething Road. The adjoining former garage site has been redeveloped for three properties, and infilling this gap between those houses and the village hall playing fields would erode the rural character of Wheelers Lane.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 4 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2148SL
Site address	Land West of Mill Lane, Seething
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None relevant
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.5ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Residential development of 12 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Access likely into the site subject to carriageway widening, frontage footway and extension of the local speed limit.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber, access likely into the site subject to carriageway widening, frontage footway and extension of the local speed limit. South of the site Mill Lane varies in width and there is a complete lack of footway linking the site to the village centre / village school.</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - no footways, but quite wide verges in front of the existing properties. NCC unlikely to object to a SL scale proposal.</p>	Amber

<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	Amber	<p>Village Shop 949m</p> <p>Bus stop within 272m and is on the bus route for Anglian 86</p> <p>Primary School is within 676m</p> <p>No footpaths</p>	
		<p>Village Hall 949m</p> <p>Recreational ground/play area next to village hall</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	<p>Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed.</p> <p>AW advise sewers crossing the site.</p>	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. NCC Minerals & Waste - underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, <u>if the site area was amended to over 1ha</u> , should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1. Surface water Flood depth 1-1000 in the road	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>)		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated. Landscape meeting - This is an open site with no trees or issues identified.	Amber

Townscape	Green	<p>The sites are located in a distinctly rural part of the District on the edge of Seething . Existing buildings in the wider context are of mixed architectural character incorporating a range of materials and styles, with village ponds also a feature. The grain in Seething is generally quite spacious especially the more peripheral areas and vegetation remains quite dominant along the streets, and relatively few buildings are located close to the back of the street except more toward the centre, but even there hedgerows are a key feature.</p> <p>Not adjacent development boundary. Adjacent to a linear form of development separated from the main village.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site</p>	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB. St Margaret’s Church is located to the south. Separated from the site by intervening land uses. Seething Old hall and Church Monument are located to the west with open countryside between, with some tree screening.</p> <p>HES - Amber</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>South of the site Mill Lane varies in width and there is a complete lack of footway linking the site to the village centre / village school.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Res, access likely into the site subject to carriageway widening, frontage footway and extension of the local speed limit. South of the site Mill Lane varies in width and there is a complete lack of footway linking the site to the village centre / village school.</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - no footways, but quite wide verges in front of the existing properties. NCC unlikely to object to a SL scale proposal.</p>	<p>Red</p> <p>Amber</p>
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green - ? As Sewage Works bang next door	Agricultural/residential/Sewage works	Amber

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB's.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site.</p>	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access likely into the site subject to carriageway widening, frontage footway and extension of the local speed limit	
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)	Agricultural/residential/Sewage works	

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)	Residential to the south. Tree screen and sewage treatment works to the west. Sewage treatment works to the north and open boundary. Open boundary to the road	
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)	Sewage treatment works	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is visible from the road network, and the open landscape.	
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)	Remote from the main centre of the village. No existing development boundary. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated. Views of the sites are afforded from both the surrounding road network and the open landscape. 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		
Conclusion	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? <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>	Statement from promoter advising same	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <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 suitable size for SL extension, however there is no existing development boundary. Potential adverse impacts on Heritage assets. Landscape and highway safety.

Site Visit Observations Remote from the main centre of the village. No existing development boundary. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated. Views of the sites are afforded from both the surrounding road network and the open landscape. 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: Reasonable – Although at the edge of the village, the site is less than 1km from the local services and facilities; Mill Lane has no footways, but wide verges, and there are footways on the main Brooke Road (although some upgrades may be required). The north east corner of the site contains a small waste-water treatment plant; however, the site itself has few features and is relatively unconstrained, and a small extension to the current linear pattern of development is considered reasonable. Allocating this site would require a Settlement Limit to be defined for the remainder of Mill Lane.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 4 December 2020