

Spooner Row & Sutton  
Village Cluster  
Site Assessment Forms

## Contents

SN0227 .....	3
SN0404 .....	10
SN0444 .....	17
SN0445 .....	25
SN0446 .....	32
SN0447 .....	40
SN0448 .....	49
SN0567 .....	56
SN0568 .....	65
SN0569 .....	74
SN2082 .....	81
SN2157 .....	89
SN2181 .....	96
SN3022 .....	104
SN4060 .....	111

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

### Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0227
Site address	Land at Eleven Mile Lane, Sutton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary - unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.67 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocation  (The site has been promoted for 18 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	16 dwellings at 25dph  18 dwellings equates to 26dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Narrow access between existing dwellings</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red.</b> The local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to its restricted width and lack of footway. No footway to the catchment primary school. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.</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	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 2km, with no footways  Distance to bus service 375 metres  Local employment 200 metres	
		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 2km  Distance to Three Boars public house 2.4km	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local sewerage networks likely to require upgrades	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but not sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some areas of surface water flooding on site but should not preclude development on site as the site design could reflect these areas	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	

SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Fringe Farmland	
		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland No loss of high grade agricultural land.	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Contained within existing pattern of development with little impact on wider landscape.	Green
Townscape	Green	Backland development, although there is some limited similar development. However, there is no precedent for estate scale development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Potential non-designated heritage assets nearby  <b>HES</b> – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local highway network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to its restricted width and lack of footway. No footway to the catchment primary school. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Suton is a small settlement consisting of small scale mainly linear development. Development of this site would take the form of a small estate development which would not be in keeping with this existing pattern of development.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Narrow access between dwellings which may not be able to accommodate an adoptable highway. Highways to advise on the local road network capacity.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential on all sides other than agricultural land to north. No compatibility issues – design of the site would need to consider existing residential amenities.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees on most boundaries – some potentially significant trees	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is very contained with only glimpsed view of site through access	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable due to constrained access, nature of local road network and impact on form and character of rural settlement	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

### Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No – promoter advises that enquiries have been received		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately		
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green



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

## Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p><b>Suitability</b> The site is of a suitable size for allocation. Development on the site would result in a backland form of development that is not currently in evidence in Sutton. Access to the site would be between two dwellings and the local highway network is not considered to be sufficient to support development in this location. A small area of flood risk has been identified on the site although it is considered that with appropriate design this could be avoided.</p> <p><b>Site Visit Observations</b> Backland site in rural settlement where there is no precedent for estate scale development. Access into site is narrow and constrained.</p> <p><b>Local Plan Designations</b> There are no conflicting LP designations</p> <p><b>Availability</b> Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p><b>Achievability</b> Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p><b>OVERALL CONCLUSION:</b> The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE for allocation. A number of constraints have been identified, including highways concerns about creating an appropriate access into the site as well as the wider highway network. An estate form of development is also considered to be an inappropriate form and scale of development in this rural settlement which is characterised by a small scale mainly linear pattern of development.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 17 November 2020

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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0404
<b>Site address</b>	Land to the south-east of Chapel Road, Spooner Row (rear of allocation SPO1)
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	No planning history other than that linked with allocation to the front of the site
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.76 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension</b>	Allocation  (Promoted for 12-15 dwellings)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	19 dwellings at 25dph  19pdh at 15 dwellings
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access would need to be through existing allocation (same site owner)  <b>SNC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The site would appear remote from the highway with no defined means of access.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 850 metres, mainly with footway  Distance to bus service and railway station 700 metres	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 760 metres  Distance to Three Boars public house 420 metres	Green

Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local sewerage network is likely to require upgrades	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, and electricity are available but not sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues  <b>HES</b> – Amber	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Identified surface water flood risk along highway	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would relate to existing settlement in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Green
Townscape	Green	Site would be backland development in context of linear pattern of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Potential impact on non-designated heritage assets	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Chapel Road is constrained  <b>SNC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The site would appear remote from the highway with no defined means of access.	Amber

Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green
------------------------	-------	------------------------------	-------

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Creation of a second line of dwellings extending eastwards into the open countryside will erode the rural character of the approach to the village from the north and would not be a compatible form of development. Lack of boundaries around the site would increase the visibility of the development.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be achieved through the allocation, however widening works may be required to Chapel Road which could result in loss of the hedgerow	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential allocation immediately to west with existing residential development on opposite side of Chapel Road to west. Existing residential development to south, with agricultural land to north and east. No compatibility issues.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Most boundaries are undefined as currently forms part of larger field. Trees and hedging on southern boundary.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees and hedging on southern boundary contain potential habitat	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No existing infrastructure or contamination	

Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views of site from north as approach village. Development would also be visible in longer views from Guilers Lane to east	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site would not be in keeping with form and character and would have adverse impact on rural approach to village. It may also lead to pressure to remove hedge for road widening.	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Road widening likely to be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability (advised that a viability statement would be available on request)	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site is of a suitable size for allocation and is adjacent to existing development. Development of this site would constitute backland development and would break out into the rural surroundings. Highways constraints have been identified, including a requirement for access via the existing planning consent adjacent to the site. Creation of a suitable access may also result in the loss of hedgerow.

**Site Visit Observations** Site is to the rear of an as-yet unbuilt allocation. However, the existing allocation consists of a continuation of linear pattern of development where this would consist of backland or estate development that would be much more visible in the rural approach to the village from the north.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting LP designations

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available

**Achievability** Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable. The site promoter advises a viability assessment has been undertaken and would be available on request (this would require updating).

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for allocation. Development of the site would constitute backland development and would have an adverse impact on the form and character of the existing linear pattern of development. It would also have a detrimental impact on the approach to the village from the north. Access would be required through existing allocation and may require the loss of additional hedgerow.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 November 2020



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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0444
<b>Site address</b>	Land west of Bunwell Road, Spooner Row
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Historic refusal for residential development
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	3.64 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension</b>	Allocation  (The site promoter has suggested that the site could accommodate between 44 – 61 dwellings, as well as open space)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	At 25dph the site could accommodate up to 91 dwellings  The site has been promoted with a density up to 16dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Constraints from hedging, traffic calming features and inside of bend</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber.</b>                      Site access likely subject to improvements to continuous frontage footway (2m wide) to connect with existing facilities, c/w widening to 5.5m, extension of local speed limit and review of associated gateway features. 2 points of access onto Bunwell Road. Removal of all / most of existing frontage hedge likely. Footway improvements likely around junction with Station Road.</p>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> o Primary School o Secondary school o Local healthcare services o Retail services o Local employment opportunities o Peak-time public transport	Amber	<p>Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 540 metres</p> <p>Distance to bus service or railway station 390 metres</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 440 metres  Distance to Three Boars public house 100 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewerage network is likely to require upgrades	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	North-eastern part in flood zones 2 and 3a, with surface water flood risk along entire length of highway past site.	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (Land Use Consultants 2001)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would relate to existing settlement in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.  <b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER</b> - short length of hedgerow; relatively open site; could achieve something to complement dwellings on the opposite side of Bunwell Road.	Amber

Townscape	Green	<p>Within existing mixed pattern of development. Mix of linear and (new) estate development.</p> <p><b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE &amp; DESIGN OFFICER</b> - a large area and will make the settlement more clustered – however there is an argument that the village should perhaps be becoming more clustered rather continuing long stretches of linear development in terms of being in closer proximity to village services. It could also provide a useful sized public space to also serve existing housing.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Grade II listed house to south of site</p> <p><b>HES</b> – Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local road network is constrained</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Site access likely subject to improvements to continuous frontage footway (2m wide) to connect with existing facilities, c/w widening to 5.5m, extension of local speed limit and review of associated gateway features. 2 points of access onto Bunwell Road. Removal of all / most of existing frontage hedge likely. Footway improvements likely around junction with Station Road.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Land at risk of flooding to north of site prevents development in part of site that would be most appropriate in townscape terms. Development to south of site would relate to new development in allocation on opposite side of road but would lead undeveloped gap to north and has potential issues in relation to setting of listed building.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential constraints on access, however NCC Highways have suggested site could be acceptable subject to footway and carriageway widening, extension of local speed limit and review of associated gateway features. May result in loss of hedging	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land, with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north and to east of opposite side of Bunwell Road. Single (listed) residential dwelling to south. Agricultural land to west. No compatibility issues.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is relatively level, slightly higher to south.	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge on part of highway boundary. Hedge and trees along western boundary.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedges and trees, and associated with watercourse to north.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No existing infrastructure or contamination on site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from Bunwell Road, particularly to the north where there is no hedge	

<p><b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>Constrained site with northern part not suitable due to flood risk. Southern part of site is therefore detached from existing development to the north, although it does still relate to new development on the opposite side of Bunwell Road to the east. Development of this part of the site would involve the loss of part or all of the hedgerow along the highway boundary with the southern part of the site and has potential issues with the setting of the listed building to the south although there is some natural screening. Unlikely to be preferred site but could be a reasonable alternative, subject to views of Senior Heritage and Design Officer</p>	<p>Amber</p>
---	--	--------------

#### Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Footway improvements, carriageway widening, extension of speed limit and review of associated gateway features would be required by highway authority.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but confirmation of viability for a smaller site than they are promoting would be required	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Various identified but as part of a much larger strategic development along with other sites in the village	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** As promoted the site is too large for allocation in accordance with the requirements of the VCHAP however it could be reduced in size. The northern section of the site is within flood zones 2 and 3a therefore development of the site would need to avoid these areas. An estate form development to the south of the site would complement new development on the opposite side of Bunwell Road. Development of the site would result in the loss of some hedgerow.

**Site Visit Observations** Relatively open field with hedgerow along southern part of highway boundary. Avoiding northern part of site due to flood risk leaves gap between any new development and existing development to the north on this side of Bunwell Road, however development would relate to new development on allocation on opposite side of Bunwell Road to east. Listed building to south does benefit from natural screening but the impact of development would need to be considered.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting LP designations

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available

**Achievability** Development of the site is achievable subject to avoidance of areas of flood zone 2 and 3a.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be a REASONABLE option for allocation subject to a reduction in the overall site area to meet to the objectives of the VCHAP and to avoid the identified areas of flood zones 2 and 3a within the site (subject to comments of the LLFA). Development would be to the south of the site and would complement the new development on the opposite side of Bunwell Road. Development to the south of the site would result in the loss of hedgerow along the road frontage in order to create a suitable access into the site.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 17 November 2020



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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0445
<b>Site address</b>	Land south of Station Road, Spooner Row
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Recently withdrawn application for up to 40 dwellings (2018/1950)
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	4.08 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension</b>	Allocation  (The site has been promoted for between 39 to 54 dwellings)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	18 – 25dph at the promoted scale of development
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Long frontage onto Station Road should enable access  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Subject to providing acceptable visibility, frontage carriageway widening, frontage footway (2m wide), continuous footway to the village hall. Previous application 9/7/18/1950.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 160 metres  Adjacent to railway station	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 60 metres  Distance to Three Boars public house 100 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local sewerage network is likely to require upgrade	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	North-eastern corner is in flood zones 2 and 3a. All of the site bounding the highway and most of the eastern part of the site is at risk of surface water flooding resulting in significant areas of the site being at risk from flooding	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Would lead to removal of landscape gap between different clusters of settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Linear development to east but some more nucleated development to west.	Amber

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed church to north-east of site  <b>HES</b> – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Improvements to local road network may be required  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Subject to providing acceptable visibility, frontage carriageway widening, frontage footway (2m wide), continuous footway to the village hall. Previous application 9/7/18/1950.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Adjacent to railway line which is a potential constraint. Otherwise residential and agricultural	Amber

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Unlikely to have significant impact on setting of church but would either erode or remove entirely the landscape gap between the cluster of development along Bunwell Road and Chapel Road to the east and around the station and school to the west.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable, although some off-site highway works are likely to be required	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to east and agricultural to south and on opposite side of Station Road to north with no compatibility issues. Impact of railway line to west would need to be mitigated.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	

What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Highway boundary is largely open. Hedging and trees on boundaries to east and south, and also on boundary with railway	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power line runs north-south across centre of site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Station Road	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Significant visual harm from erosion or complete removal of gap between different parts of settlement.	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Frontage carriageway widening and footway, plus footway link to village hall would be required by NCC Highways	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but confirmation of viability for a smaller site than they are promoting would be required	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Various identified but as part of a much larger strategic development along with other sites in the village	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** As promoted the site is of a scale that is incompatible with both the existing settlement and the objectives of the VCHAP. The site could be reduced in size to address this issue. A number of off-site highway works have been identified should this site be allocated and some significant areas of flood risk 2 and 3a have been identified within the site. These areas would impact upon the developable area and would result in development being located in areas of the site with a poorer relationship to the existing built form having an adverse impact on the townscape.

**Site Visit Observations** Open field which provides gap in between area of settlement around the station and the area of settlement along Bunwell Road and Chapel Road.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting LP designations

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available

**Achievability** Development of the site is achievable subject to a reduction in site area and avoidance of identified areas of flood risk 2 and 3a

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for allocation. As promoted the site is excessive in scale however it could be reduced in size. Notwithstanding this, development of the most logical areas of the site would be constrained by significant areas of flood zone 2 and 3a. Significant offsite highway works have also been identified as necessary to make this site acceptable in highway terms. There would also be a detrimental landscape impact associated with the development of this site.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 18 November 2020

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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0446
<b>Site address</b>	Land north of Guilers Lane and east of Chapel Road, Spooner Row
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary - unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Part of recently withdrawn application to provide car park as public benefit associated with proposal for 40 dwellings on site SN0445 (2018/1950)
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.94 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension</b>	Both  (The site has been promoted for a smaller number of dwellings – 4/5 on 0.45ha with an additional 0.49ha promoted for open space – but is of a scale that could be considered as an allocation site)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	5dph at 5 dwellings  23 dwellings at 25dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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



### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access options constrained by visibility and capacity of Guilers Lane</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Subject to access from Chapel Road with localised carriageway widening to 5.5m and provision of 2.0m footway at frontage. Development should safeguard visibility at adjacent junction of Chapel Road / Guilers Lane. Footway improvements likely fronting the nearby PH to connect with existing footway to the south.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 420 metres</p> <p>Distance to railway station 300 metres</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 340 metres  Adjacent to Three Boars public house	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Identified surface water risk along Guilers Lane	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would relate to existing settlement in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Green
Townscape	Green	Estate form of development would not be characteristic of this part of the settlement. A linear pattern of development would be more compatible.	Amber

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No protected sites in close proximity however presence of nearby ponds suggests protected species may be an issue	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed church to west and Grade II listed Pilgrims Farmhouse to east – impact to be assessed further if the site progresses.	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local highway network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Subject to access from Chapel Road with localised carriageway widening to 5.5m and provision of 2.0m footway at frontage. Development should safeguard visibility at adjacent junction of Chapel Road / Guilers Lane. Footway improvements likely fronting the nearby PH to connect with existing footway to the south.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural, residential and place of worship.	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site affects setting of two listed buildings – church to west and farmhouse to east along with former barns of farmhouse which can be considered non-designated heritage assets as can the public house to the south. Developing this site would therefore have an adverse impact on the relationship between all these buildings and the form and character of the area.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is possible from Chapel Road with some highway improvements although this is likely to lead to loss of part or all of hedgerow along this boundary and potentially some trees.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Converted barns to east, public house to south on opposite side of Guilders Lane and church to west. Not considered that there are compatibility issues which would preclude development.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow with trees along Chapel Road boundary and partly along Guilders Lane.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging along boundaries. Ponds on adjacent land will need consideration	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site available both from Chapel Road and Guilders Lane	

<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of this site would have adverse impact on form and character of area and on setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets	Red
--	--	-----

### Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Off-site highway works would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but as part of a larger strategic development. Confirmation of viability for a smaller site than they are promoting would be required	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Open space on the site	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site has been promoted as one of a number of sites within the settlement intended to form a larger strategic development. This would be outside the objectives of the VCHAP. Considered on its own merits the site would be of a suitable size for allocation but has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings that could be considered as an inefficient use of the land. A number of constraints have been identified including the impact of the development of this site on both designated and non-designated heritage assets as well as the form and character of this part of Spooner Row. A number of off-site highway works would be required.

**Site Visit Observations** The site forms an important part of the setting of listed Pilgrims Farm and associated former barns and its relationship with the church to the west and the public house to the south. Development of the site would have an adverse impact on this and would also be likely to lead to the loss of hedgerows and possibly veteran trees.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting LP designations

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available

**Achievability** Development of the site is achievable

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for either an allocation or an extension to the settlement limit. Development of the site would impact on both designated and non-designated heritage assets and would also have a detrimental impact on the form and character of this part of the settlement. There would also be a likely landscape impact resulting from the loss of hedgerow and mature trees. A smaller area of development is not considered to address these concerns adequately due to the prominent location of the site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 18 November 2020

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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0447
<b>Site address</b>	Land west of Chapel Road, Spooner Row
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Historic refusal for residential purposes on southern part of site
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	6.84 hectares (net developable area 2.93 hectares)
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension</b>	Allocation  The site has been promoted for between 59 to 88 dwellings at 20 to 30 dph
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	73 dwellings at 25dph (restricted across the developable area)
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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



### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access should be achievable, however some constraints depending on where it is proposed</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber.            Site should be served by two points of access, one onto Station Road and the other onto Chapel Road. Access to Chapel Lane to require localised carriageway widening to 5.5m, confirmation of adequate forward visibility and 2m wide frontage footway connecting with existing provision. Access to Station Road to require road widening to 6m and widening of frontage footway to 2m. Likely to require removal of mature trees to achieve acceptable visibility. Widening of existing footway to village school and extension of footway up to school entrance.</p>	Amber

Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport  <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 200 metres  Adjacent to railway station	
		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 100 metres  Distance to Three Boars public house	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater network capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Centre of site in flood zone 3a, with remainder of western part of site largely with flood zone 2. Significant parts of site are therefore at risk from flooding with only the eastern part of the site along Chapel Road not at risk. This would significantly reduce the developable areas of the site.	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x

SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Tributary Farmland with Parkland		
		Settled Plateau Farmland		
		Plateau Farmland		
		Valley Urban Fringe		
		Fringe Farmland		
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland		
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Would lead to removal or erosion of landscape gap between different clusters of settlement unless development is concentrated along Chapel Road. No loss of high grade agricultural land</p> <p><b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER</b> – Landscape concern. Development shown to the north of the site; access from Chapel Rd would result in both hedgerow and tree loss and would not be supported; access from Station Road unlikely to be an issue although the gap between the two sections along Station Road should be retained.</p>	Amber	
Townscape	Green	<p>Linear development to east but some more nucleated development to west</p> <p><b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER</b> – Amber. This is quite a preserved landscape gap between the two main parts of the settlement. The west side of the site is best location for access to the school, railway station and the pub.</p>	Amber	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green	

Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Site is adjacent to a Grade II listed church</p> <p><b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER</b> – Amber. Development would have an impact on the setting of the chapel – affecting its existing rural setting/context of the field its rear in which it is seen however there are trees around the chapel and is a 19<sup>th</sup> century building that does not have medieval towers/ trackways.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Improvements to local road network may be required</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Site should be served by two points of access, one onto Station Road and the other onto Chapel Road. Access to Chapel Lane to require localised carriageway widening to 5.5m, confirmation of adequate forward visibility and 2m wide frontage footway connecting with existing provision. Access to Station Road to require road widening to 6m and widening of frontage footway to 2m. Likely to require removal of mature trees to achieve acceptable visibility. Widening of existing footway to village school and extension of footway up to school entrance.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING</b> - no objection in principle to a single access off Chapel Road [confirmed reduced developable area of the site]. This access is on the outside of a bend and although footways are narrow they could be improved.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Adjacent to railway line which is a potential constraint. Otherwise residential and agricultural	Amber

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development along Station Road would have impact on setting of church and would erode or remove entirely the landscape gap between the cluster of development along Bunwell Road and Chapel Road to the east and around the station and school to the west. However, there is some potential for development along Chapel Road to integrate with the existing pattern of development along that road.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways require that if the whole site is to be developed it served by two points of access, one onto Station Road and the other onto Chapel Road. Both accesses are likely to require localised carriageway widening. Access onto Chapel Road would require removal of part or all of hedgerow along frontage and potentially some trees	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to east and agricultural to north and on opposite side of Station Road to south with no compatibility issues. Impact of railway line to west would need to be mitigated	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow along Chapel Road boundary with a row of mature trees. Boundary with Station Road is more open with a fence and occasional trees. Trees on boundary with railway line.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundaries	

Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power line runs north-south across centre of site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Station Road. Views available from Chapel Road though more restricted by vegetation	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Most of the site is not suitable for development due to form and character impact as well as flood risk issues. However, there is a possibility of development along Chapel Road although there are issues regarding trees and the setting of the church that will need to be considered further.	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Road widening and the provision and/or extension of footways	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but confirmation of viability for a smaller site than they are promoting would be required	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Various identified but as part of a much larger strategic development along with other sites in the village	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site is excessive in scale and development in its entirety or at the scale promoted would not be compatible with the existing pattern of development in the settlement. However, the developable area of the site is significantly constrained by the identified areas of flood risk. The site could be reduced in area to accommodate a lower number of dwellings. Access to the site would be achieved via Chapel Road but would result in the loss of hedgerow and mature trees along the road frontage. Heritage, townscape and landscape concerns have been identified. The adjacent train line would also be a potential constrain on development to the west of the site.

**Site Visit Observations** Open field which provides gap in between area of settlement around the station and the area of settlement along Bunwell Road and Chapel Road. Open boundary along Station Road, whilst the boundary with Chapel Road has a hedge with trees in it. In terms of form and character the frontage onto Chapel Road is of lesser important to the gap between the part of the village around the station and the part of the village along Bunwell Road / Chapel Road.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting LP designations

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available.

**Achievability** Development of the site is achievable, subject to the comments of the LLFA.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE for allocation. Due to the identified areas of flood risk within the site, development would be concentrated to the north of the site, closest to the rear of existing properties along Chapel Road. This would lessen the erosion of the gap between the two distinct areas of the settlement but would impact on identified heritage assets and result in the loss of hedgerow and mature trees along Chapel Road. Off-site highway works would also be required.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 18 November 2020



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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0448
<b>Site address</b>	Land west of School Lane and north of the school
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Site frontage on School Lane is allocated for residential development in the Local Plan (SPO2); remainder of site is outside the development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	Planning permission granted on allocated site for seven dwellings (2016/0627, with subsequent amendments)
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	4.13 hectares (including allotments and land for the school) (net developable area 1.50 hectares)
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension</b>	Allocation  (The site has been promoted for between 27 to 38 dwellings)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	(The site has been promoted for between 27 to 38 dwellings at 18 to 25 dph)
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access is constrained by nature of School Lane</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Access into the site likely to be subject to 2m footway and localised carriageway widening to 5.5m. School Lane is inadequate for additional development by reason of restricted carriageway width, lack of footway and no continuous footway to the adjacent school. All development traffic would be in conflict with school at School Lane / Station Road junction.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Adjacent to Spooner Row Primary School</p> <p>Distance to railway station 250 metres</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 200 metres  Distance to Three Boars public house 550 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified surface water flood risk in east of site and along School Lane	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would relate to existing settlement in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Green
Townscape	Amber	Estate development would not be characteristic of development along School Lane	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green

Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity  <b>HES</b> – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road and footpath capacity is unsuitable  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Access into the site likely to be subject to 2m footway and localised carriageway widening to 5.5m. School Lane is inadequate for additional development by reason of restricted carriageway width, lack of footway and no continuous footway to the adjacent school. All development traffic would be in conflict with school at School Lane / Station Road junction.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	School, recreation facilities, residential and agricultural	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The creation of an estate scale development would not be in keeping with the character of School Lane, although could be acceptable if access was able to be secured from elsewhere	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	School Lane is very constrained and NCC Highways have commented that it is inadequate for additional development	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land, with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	School and recreation area to south. Residential properties to east on opposite side of School Lane. Residential properties to north. Agricultural land to west. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge on highway boundary, with hedging and trees on other boundaries	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from School Lane	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable for any further development than that already allocated due to constrained access along School Lane	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Site is under option to a developer/ promoter		
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately		
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Improvements would be likely to be required but may not be deliverable due to constraints along School Lane	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but confirmation of viability for a smaller site than they are promoting would be required	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Various identified but as part of a much larger strategic development along with other sites in the village	

## Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p><b>Suitability</b> As promoted the site is excessive in size but could be reduced in size to accommodate a smaller number of dwellings. Concerns have been raised by highways about creating a safe access to the site as well as School Lane. An estate form of development would not be compatible with the form and character of the existing development along School Lane.</p> <p><b>Site Visit Observations</b> Field to the rear of school and recreation area. Access along School Lane is highly constrained. Landscape impact of estate development.</p> <p><b>Local Plan Designations</b> Site frontage on School Lane is allocated for residential development in the Local Plan (SPO2); no conflicting LP designations.</p> <p><b>Availability</b> Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p><b>Achievability</b> The promoter advises that the site is achievable however this is based on a larger site area and access constraints may mean that delivery of the site can not be achieved.</p> <p><b>OVERALL CONCLUSION:</b> The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE for allocation. School Lane has been identified as being constrained in highways terms and is not considered to be appropriate for further development (following development of the existing allocation site SCO2). Although the site relates reasonably well to the settlement, development of the scale proposed and/ or of an estate form is not considered to be compatible in either form or character with the existing linear pattern of development.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 18 November 2020

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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0567
<b>Site address</b>	Land south of Station Road and west of Queensland, Spooner Row
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Undetermined hybrid application for eight dwellings on the site (2018/2071). Previous outline consent for eight dwellings (2017/1321)
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.79 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension</b>	Allocation  (The site has been promoted for 10-15 dwellings)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	15 dwellings would equate to 18 dph  25dph would equate to 19 dwellings
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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



### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

Where a HELAA Assessment has indicated either a RED or AMBER score, has the promoter of the site submitted any supporting evidence to indicate that the issues can be overcome (e.g., a Flood Risk Assessment, Contaminated Land Survey, Ecological Survey)? If yes, and if appropriate, note any changes to the HELAA score in the Site Score column. Additional criteria have been included under 'Accessibility to local services and facilities' and 'Landscape', which need to be reflected in the Site Score. *(Please note boxes filled with grey should not be completed)*

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential constraints on access to site from trees along highway boundary</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber.</p> <p>Subject to frontage development, access from Station Road, provision of acceptable visibility and 2m wide frontage footway. Could require removal of mature tree(s). Footway improvements required to link the site to the village school and existing footway to the east. Site has already been subject to a planning application.</p> <p><b>(UPDATED HIGHWAYS MEETING 27/01/21</b> - Potentially good option for development. Opposite the school, therefore no need for children to use the railway crossing. Supports the Community Council's aspiration for better pedestrian access to Top Common. SN0567 has previously had permission for frontage development but this lapsed. <i>Post meeting note: frontage development on 0567 was via private drive(s) and therefore more extensive tree/hedge removal might be required for the combined site)</i></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	Opposite side of road from Spooner Row Primary School  Distance to railway station 150 metres	
		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 100 metres  Distance to Three Boars public house 450 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified surface water flood risk along boundary with highway	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Development would relate to existing settlement in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.</p> <p><b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER</b> - a larger allocation would result in a loss of hedgerow frontage and potentially also trees further along the road; possible conflict with local character; landscape caution.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Green	<p>A linear form of development would be in keeping with the form and character of the settlement</p> <p><b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE &amp; DESIGN OFFICER</b> – continuation of linear development – in combination with SN2082 it could provide a useful public open space for the village</p>	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>School to north of site could be considered a non-designated heritage asset</p> <p><b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE &amp; DESIGN OFFICER</b> – no issues</p>	Green

Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Some local highway improvements may be required</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber.  Subject to frontage development, access from Station Road, provision of acceptable visibility and 2m wide frontage footway. Could require removal of mature tree(s). Footway improvements required to link the site to the village school and existing footway to the east. Site has already been subject to a planning application.</p> <p><i>(UPDATED HIGHWAYS MEETING 27/01/21 - Potentially good option for development. Opposite the school, therefore no need for children to use the railway crossing. Supports the Community Council’s aspiration for better pedestrian access to Top Common. SN0567 has previously had permission for frontage development, but this lapsed. Post meeting note: frontage development on 0567 was via private drive(s) and therefore more extensive tree/hedge removal might be required for the combined site)</i></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Frontage development along the site boundary as previously approved can be achieved without significant harm to the townscape or the setting of the school. Linear development would be of similar form to development.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access has been demonstrated to be achievable for this scale of development through the planning application process (although this was via a private drive)	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to east, agricultural to south and west. School on opposite side of Station Road to north.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge with a couple of trees on Station Road boundary. Hedges on boundary with Top Common and residential property to east. No defined southern boundary as part of larger field.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some habitat in hedgerows and trees on boundary	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Station Road and from the east and south along Top Common.	

<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of this site could be accommodated without resulting in significant harm to the landscape or form and character of the settlement.	Green
--	--	-------

### Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No – promoter notes that enquiries have been received		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Footway improvements likely to be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Reference to footpath to Station Road	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site is considered to be a suitable site for a small allocation, or as part of a larger site in-combination with SN2082. The site relates well to the settlement and a linear pattern of development (as previously approved on the site) would complement the existing pattern of development. No significant highways issues have been raised although it is noted that the approved scheme was accessed via a private drive. Landscape concerns have been raised about the loss of trees and hedgerow, as well as the impact a larger allocation would have on the local landscape.

**Site Visit Observations** Part of larger field where development could be accommodated without exceeding the western extent of development along the northern side of Station Road.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting LP designations

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available.

**Achievability** Development of the site is achievable. Planning permission has previously been obtained for development on this site (but has subsequently lapsed).

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be a REASONABLE site for a small allocation on its own merits, but could also be considered as a larger site in-combination with SN2082. The site has previously had the benefit of planning permission. A linear development on the site would complement the existing pattern of development in evidence and the site would have a good relationship with the settlement. No significant access constraints have been identified at this time although concerns have been raised about the likely loss of hedgerow along the site frontage and the possible need to remove trees off-site to create an adequate access to the site.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 19 November 2020



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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0568
<b>Site address</b>	Land to south of Station Road and west of Top Common, Spooner Row
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Historic refusal for residential development
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.9 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension</b>	Both  (The site has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings – 10 – but is of suitable size to be considered as an allocation)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	10 dwellings would equate to 11dph  25dph would equate to 22 dwellings
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

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

<p>Access to the site</p>	<p>Amber</p>	<p>Access would be onto rural road with 60mph speed limit</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber.  Site boundary remote from highway. Unclear how it would be accessed. Subject to demonstrating the frontage abuts Top Common it is likely an access could be provided subject to frontage development, localised carriageway widening to 5.5m, 2m site frontage footway, extension of local speed limit on Top Common and Station Road and demonstration of adequate visibility at Top Common / Station Road junction. No existing footway to village school. Would need to provide one.</p> <p><i>(NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING - Top Common itself is narrow with no footways and a poor junction with Station Road. In isolation this site would not be supported. However, the development at The Bungalow, Station Road will provide a footpath back to the school and if allocated with the development opposite, could provide more substantial improvements to Top Common/the junction.)</i></p>	<p>Amber</p>
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	<p>Amber</p>	<p>Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 200 metres</p> <p>Distance to railway station 350 metres</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 300 metres  Distance to Three Boars public house 650 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified surface water flood risk in northern part of site and along Top Common but this area could be excluded from the developable area	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (Land Use Consultants 2001)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	

Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have poor relationship with existing settlement in landscape when approaching the settlement from the west along Station Road. No loss of high grade agricultural land  <b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER</b> - Not acceptable in landscape terms as development in this location results in further breakout into the surrounding countryside and would adversely impact on the landscape	Amber
Townscape	Green	Potential to continue existing pattern of linear development along Top Common but this would appear detached from the main areas of development along Station Road	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity  <b>HES</b> – Amber	Green

Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Road is constrained with no footways</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber.  Site boundary remote from highway. Unclear how it would be accessed. Subject to demonstrating the frontage abuts Top Common it is likely an access could be provided subject to frontage development, localised carriageway widening to 5.5m, 2m site frontage footway, extension of local speed limit on Top Common and Station Road and demonstration of adequate visibility at Top Common / Station Road junction. No existing footway to village school. Would need to provide one.</p> <p><b>(NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING - Top Common itself is narrow with no footways and a poor junction with Station Road. In isolation this site would not be supported. However, the development at The Bungalow, Station Road will provide a footpath back to the school and if allocated with the development opposite, could provide more substantial improvements to Top Common/the junction.)</b></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Some potential to link to development along Top Common, however as a standalone site this development would largely appear detached from the main settlement when approaching from the west along Station Road, protruding into the open countryside	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable from Top Common, although this would result in loss of hedgerow. NCC to advise about suitability of local roads.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural land on all sides other than dwellings to south. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges along highway boundaries. No defined boundary to west as part of wider field.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedges on boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power line running north – south on western part of site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Station Road and Top Common	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is detached from main settlement and would protrude into open countryside to west	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green



Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Footway link to village and speed limit extension would be required by NCC Highways	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p><b>Suitability</b> The site is of a suitable size for allocation and is adjacent to an existing settlement limit boundary. A small area of flood risk has been identified to the north of the site and would reduce the developable area of the site. Linear development on the site would be compatible with the existing pattern of development along Top Common however a significant landscape impact has been identified and the site would appear detached from the main areas of the settlement when viewed from Station Road. Access to the site would need to be demonstrated as being achievable and off-site highway works have been identified. Development of the site would likely result in the loss of frontage hedgerow.</p> <p><b>Site Visit Observations</b> Site that is detached from existing settlement on approach from west along Station Road and would therefore be intrusive into open landscape on this approach.</p> <p><b>Local Plan Designations</b> No conflicting LP designations</p> <p><b>Availability</b> Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p><b>Achievability</b> Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p><b>OVERALL CONCLUSION:</b> The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for allocation and also as an extension to the existing settlement limit. Due to identified on-site constraints development would be to the south of the site and would appear detached from the main body of the settlement when viewed from Station Road. Development of the site would have an adverse landscape impact and would also likely result in the loss of frontage hedgerow. A suite of off-site highways works have been identified and it would need to be confirmed that access into the site could be achieved.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0569
<b>Site address</b>	Land west of Bunwell Road and south of Queens Street, Spooner Row
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	No planning history
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.68 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension</b>	Both  (The site has been submitted for 5 to 8 dwellings but is large enough to be considered as an allocation)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	8 dwellings would equate to 11dph  25dph would equate to 17 dwellings
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access options constrained by rural nature of road and hedgerow  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Bunwell Road in the vicinity of the site subject to a 40mph. Visibility of 2.4m x 120m unlikely to be achievable. No footway and/or continuous footway to the village school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 1km  Distance to railway station 850 metres	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 900 metres  Distance to Three Boars public house 550 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified surface water flood risk at north and extreme south of site	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site does not relate well to main areas of settlement within landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Area of sporadic development which development of this site would consolidate	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green

Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed building to north of site  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Bunwell Road in the vicinity of the site subject to a 40mph. Visibility of 2.4m x 120m unlikely to be achievable. No footway and/or continuous footway to the village school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would have an urbanising effect on the surrounding area which is characterised more by sporadic development south of the junction of Bunwell Road and Hill Road. Development would also have an adverse impact on the rural setting of the listed building to the north, the principle elevation of which faces into the site.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways raise doubts about likelihood of adequate visibility being achievable. Also pedestrian access to site is poor.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north and south and on opposite side of Bunwell Road. Agricultural land otherwise. No compatibility issues.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	

What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge along boundary with Bunwell Road and Queens Street. Hedge and trees along boundary with south. Western boundary is undefined as part of larger field.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedges on site boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from Bunwell Road and Queens Street.	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site not suitable for development as would lead to a loss of rural character and harm setting of listed building.	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Footway provision may be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site is of a suitable size for allocation. The site is not adjacent to an existing settlement limit. Development of the site would have an urbanising effect and would erode the rural character by further extending the settlement. Highways constraints have been identified, including the difficulties of creating a safe access to the site. The adverse impact of development on the adjacent listed building has also been identified as a significant constraint.

**Site Visit Observations** Bunwell Road has rural character south of its junction with Hill Road with only sporadic development. Infill development on sites such as this would erode that rural character resulting in an urbanising effect. The site also forms part of the setting to the listed building to the north, the principle elevation of which faces onto the site.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting LP designations

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available.

**Achievability** The promoter has confirmed that development of the site is achievable however a number of significant constraints have been identified.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE site for allocation, as well as UNREASONABLE as an extension to the existing settlement limit. Development of the site would erode the rural character that is in evidence, particularly on the approach to the settlement along Bunwell Road. Furthermore, the adjacent listed building faces into the site and development of the site would have a detrimental impact on its setting. Highways have also raised significant concerns about the ability to achieve appropriate visibility splays if developing this site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020



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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN2082
<b>Site address</b>	Land south of Station Road and east of Top Common, Spooner Row
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Planning permission on land to front of site (see SN0567)
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	2.89 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension</b>	Allocation  (the site has been promoted for up to 30 dwellings)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	30 dwellings equates to 10dph  25dph equates to 72 dwellings
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential constraints on access to site from trees along highway boundary if through site SN0567, if not access will need to be from Top Common which is constrained</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Subject to access via SN0567 / Station Road only and footway improvements to the village school.</p> <p><b>(NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING - Potentially good options for development. Opposite the school, therefore no need for children to use the railway crossing. Supports the Community Council's aspiration for better pedestrian access to Top Common.)</b></p>	Amber

Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> o Primary School o Secondary school o Local healthcare services o Retail services o Local employment opportunities o Peak-time public transport  <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus o Village/ community hall o Public house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Spooner Row Primary School in close proximity via site SN0567  Distance to railway station within 200 metres via site SN0567	
		Distance to Spooner Row village hall within 150 metres via site SN0567  Distance to Three Boars public house within 500 metres via site SN0567	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Area of site close to boundary with Top Common is at risk of surface water flooding	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Development would relate to existing settlement in landscape if developed with site SN0567. No loss of high grade agricultural land.</p> <p><b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER</b> - a larger allocation would result in a loss of hedgerow frontage and potentially also trees further along the road; possible conflict with local character; landscape caution.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Green	<p>Development of the site would be a more estate form of development than is typical of Spooner Row, however it is adjacent to development accessed off private drives behind the frontage development</p> <p><b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER</b> - in combination with SN0567 (although more clustered) could provide a useful public open space for the village.</p>	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>School to north of site could be considered a non-designated heritage asset</p> <p><b>HES</b> – Amber</p>	Amber

Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Some local highway improvements may be required for access through site SN0567. Top Common is very constrained if access is proposed from that road</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Subject to access via SN0567 / Station Road only and footway improvements to the village school.</p> <p><b>(NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING - Potentially good options for development. Opposite the school, therefore no need for children to use the railway crossing. Supports the Community Council's aspiration for better pedestrian access to Top Common.)</b></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would only be achievable with site SN0567. This would be likely to introduce estate development, however given depth of development from Station Road immediately to the east this could be acceptable.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access can be achieved through site SN0567.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to east, agricultural to south and west. School on opposite side of Station Road from site SN0567 to north.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	

What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges on boundary with Top Common and residential property to east. No defined southern boundary as part of larger field. No defined northern or southern boundary as part of larger field.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some habitat in hedgerows and trees on boundary	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Station Road and from the east and south along Top Common.	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of this site could be acceptable with SN0567	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Footway improvements likely to be required along Station Road	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site would need to be reduced in size but this can be achieved to suit the numbers considered appropriate for an allocation. Development of the site would most logically occur as an extension to the adjacent site SN0567. NCC Highways have advised access should be obtained from Station Road, which would result in the loss of hedgerow and trees along the site frontage. Small areas of identified surface water flood risk along the western edge of the site. Landscape concerns about development of this site have been raised.

**Site Visit Observations** Part of a larger field where development could be accommodated without exceeding the western extent of development along the northern side of Station Road or the southern extent of development immediately to the east. No clear boundary to the south.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting LP designations

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available.

**Achievability** Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable. Site SN0567 appears to be within the same land ownership as SN2082.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is suitable for allocation if allocated with adjacent site SN0567 however the overall numbers on the site would need to be reduced to ensure an appropriate scale of development for the settlement. Access to the site would be required via Station Road which would result in the loss of frontage hedgerow. There would be a landscape impact resulting from the development of this combination of sites.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: January 2021



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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN2157
<b>Site address</b>	Land at Great Expectations, London Road, Sutton
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Planning permissions for uses on the site including rope climbing activity (2013/1409), model aircraft flying (1998/1361 and 2016/0721), preschool nursery (2015/1399) and auction house / salesrooms (2010/2171)
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	10 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension</b>	Allocation  (the site has been promoted for housing development of up to 12 to 25 dwellings with consideration for potentially larger development in the future)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	Up to 25dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access would be onto main road with 60mph speed limit</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red.</b>                      Site unidentifiable on current plan.                      Earlier Comments: The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.</p>	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 2.1km, mainly with no footways</p> <p>Bus service passes sites</p> <p>Local employment 300 metres away</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 2.4km  Distance to Three Boars public house 2.8km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but not sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Western part of site at risk of surface water flooding	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Open landscape that does not relate to an existing settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Site would be detached from existing patterns of development.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green

Open Space	Green	Potential loss of flying school	Amber
Transport and Roads	Amber	No footways along road  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red.</b> Site unidentifiable on current plan. Earlier Comments: The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Primarily agricultural but also flying school, pre-school and soft play centre within the proposed site boundaries and proposed for retention. Potential conflict with the flying school.	Amber

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is detached from existing settlement, although Sutton is close by. Development would therefore be an isolated development in a rural landscape	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access may be achievable subject to adequate visibility but pedestrian access is poor	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Primarily agricultural land however development to the south east of the site include leisure (flying school), a pre-school and a soft play centre.	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural land surrounds the site. No compatibility issues. Existing on-site uses: preschool nursery, soft play centre and flying school.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is relatively level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows with trees along most boundaries	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedgerows on boundaries.	

Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site from access off B1172. Otherwise very limited public views	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is remote from existing settlements and would result in isolated development in a rural landscape	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** As promoted the site is excessive in scale and does not meet the objectives of the VCHAP however it could be reduced in size to accommodate a smaller number of dwellings. The site is primarily a greenfield site however it does include some commercial tenants and a leisure use. There are some identified areas of flood risk within the site. Landscape and highways concerns have been raised due to the remote location of the site.

**Site Visit Observations** Site detached from any settlement in a rural landscape accessed directly off fast section of single carriageway road.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting LP designations

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available.

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

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for allocation. The site is excessive in size however it could be reduced in size to meet the objectives of the VCHAP however it is remote from the main centres of development with poor connectivity and it would have an adverse landscape impact. The site currently has a number of commercial tenants as well as a leisure school which may be affected by residential development on the site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN2181
<b>Site address</b>	Land east of School Lane, Spooner Row
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Site is outside the development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Recent refusal for five dwellings (2019/0483) and dismissed at appeal as well as more historic refusals for residential development
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.6 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension</b>	Allocation – 12 to 25 dwellings
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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



### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access is narrow and visibility would need to be demonstrated. The site promoter notes that Anglian Water own access to the site but the site owner has a right of access to the land. Site promoter advises agreement in principle has been reached with AW. AW also own the frontage hedgerow – possible issues re. visibility.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Limited frontage onto the highway with little opportunity for adoptable standard access. School Lane is inadequate for additional development by reason of restricted carriageway width, lack of footway and no continuous footway to the adjacent school. All development traffic would be in conflict with school at School Lane / Station Road junction.</p>	Amber

Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport  <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 150 metres  Distance to railway station 300 metres	
		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 250 metres  Distance to Three Boars public house 600 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Northern part of site is within Flood Zones 3a and 2 as well as 1. Identified surface water flood risk along School Lane	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Contained within existing pattern of development with little impact on wider landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Green
Townscape	Amber	Backland development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity  <b>HES</b> – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	School Lane is very constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Limited frontage onto the highway with little opportunity for adoptable standard access. School Lane is inadequate for additional development by reason of restricted carriageway width, lack of footway and no continuous footway to the adjacent school. All development traffic would be in conflict with school at School Lane / Station Road junction.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would have only limited harm to the character and appearance of the area given the contained nature of the site and other development in the vicinity but it would constitute backland development	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	In dismissing the appeal for the site, the Planning Inspector was not satisfied that the information provided demonstrates that adequate access and visibility can be provided without third party land. School Lane is also very constrained with NCC Highways stating that is inadequate for further development	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to south and west. Agricultural to north. Railway line to east may need to be mitigated against but would not preclude development of the site	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows and trees	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibility of common reptiles being present however this could be mitigated against. Potential habitat in hedging and trees	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site relatively well contained, though with possible glimpsed views from those travelling on trains	

<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable due to access and flood risk issue, also backland 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)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Improvements would be required to School Lane if deliverable	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site is suitable in size for a settlement limit extension or possibly a small allocation of around 12 dwellings. Development of the site would be considered as backland development. Constrained view into the site so a limited townscape impact. Identified areas of flood risk are located to the north of the site and would reduce the developable area of the site. Highways constraints have been identified, specifically relating to the creation of a safe access into the site. School Lane is also considered to be inadequate for additional traffic movements.

**Site Visit Observations** Visually contained site that could be considered backland development. Given mixed character of immediate area this could be acceptable, however the access is highly constrained.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting LP designations

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available.

**Achievability** Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable however note earlier concerns about achieving a satisfactory access to the site as well as the third party land ownership of the access.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site has been assessed as both an allocation site and an extension to the existing settlement limit and is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for development. Significant highways constraints have been identified, including concerns about the possibility of creating a suitable access to the site and the impact on School Lane. An identified area of flood risk to the north of the site would reduce the developable area. Development on this parcel of land would constitute backland development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN3022
<b>Site address</b>	Land to south of Station Road and west of Top Common, Spooner Row
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary – unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Historic refusal for residential development
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.75 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (aa) Allocated site (bb) SL extension</b>	Both  (The site has been promoted for 5-10 dwellings, though the site may be able to accommodate an allocation of 12 dwellings)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	10 dwellings equates to 13dph  12 dwellings equates to 16dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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



### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access would be onto rural road with 60mph speed limit</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Access likely onto Station Road subject to frontage footway and extension of local speed restriction. Visibility likely to require removal of frontage hedge. Footway works required to link the site to the existing village school.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 200 metres</p> <p>Distance to railway station 350 metres</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 300 metres  Distance to Three Boars public house 650 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified surface water flood risk in northern part of site and along Top Common	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have poor relationship with existing settlement in landscape when approaching the settlement from the west along Station Road. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Disconnected from other parts of settlement but linear development would be similar to existing pattern of development in evidence	Amber

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity  <b>HES</b> – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Road is constrained with no footways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Access likely onto Station Road subject to frontage footway and extension of local speed restriction. Visibility likely to require removal of frontage hedge. Footway works required to link the site to the existing village school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would largely appear detached from the main settlement when approaching from the west along Station Road, protruding into the open countryside	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable, although this would result in loss of hedgerow. NCC Highways advise that footway works would be required to link to the site to the school	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural land on all sides. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	

What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges along highway boundaries. No defined boundaries to west or south as the site is part of a larger land parcel	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedges on boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power line running north – south through site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Station Road and Top Common	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is detached from the main settlement and would protrude into open countryside to west	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting letter from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Footway link to the school would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site is of a suitable size to be allocated however it has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings (5-10 dwellings). The site is remote from the existing settlement limits. The site is detached from the main areas of the settlement and would extend further into the landscape to the west of Spooner Row. There are some identified areas of surface water flooding within the site. Access to the site would be achievable however it would require the loss of frontage hedgerow and trees resulting in landscape concerns.

**Site Visit Observations** The site is detached from the existing settlement on approach from the west along Station Road and would therefore be intrusive into open landscape on this approach.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting LP designations

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available.

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

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for either an allocation or an extension to the existing settlement limit. The site is detached from the main areas of the settlement and is not adjacent to any existing settlement boundaries. Development of this site would result in encroachment into the countryside, beyond the existing boundaries of the settlement and would have a landscape impact as a result. Development of the site would also result in the loss of frontage hedgerow and trees.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

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

### Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4060
Site address	Land south of Hill House, Bunwell Road, Spooner Row
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary - unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (cc) Allocated site (dd) SL extension	Both  (The site has been promoted for 8 dwellings but is of sufficient size to be considered as an allocation)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	8 dwellings equates to 1.6dph  Up to 75 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

### Part 3 Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access options constrained by rural nature of road and hedgerow  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Access requires removal of frontage trees & hedges. No available walking route to school/village facilities.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 1.2km  Distance to railway station 1km	



Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 1.1km  Distance to Three Boars public house 750 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but not sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified surface water flood risk on Bunwell Road, Slutshole Lane and in northern part of site  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required. The site is adjacent to minor/ moderate flooding (flowpath).	Green
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site does not relate well to main areas of settlement within landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber

Townscape	Green	Area of sporadic development which development of this site would not be in keeping	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity  <b>NCC ECOLOGY</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Potential undesignated heritage asset to north of site	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Access requires removal of frontage trees & hedges. No available walking route to school/village facilities.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would have an urbanising effect on the surrounding area which is characterised more by sporadic development south of the junction of Bunwell Road and Hill Road and from which this site protrudes into open countryside	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potentially achievable but with loss of sections of hedgerows and possibly trees. Pedestrian access to site is poor	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north and opposite side of Bunwell Road from northern part of site. Agricultural land otherwise. No compatibility issues	

What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge along boundaries with Bunwell Road and Slutshole Lane with trees particularly on boundaries with southern portion of site. Hedge and trees along other boundaries.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedges on site boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across the site from Bunwell Road and Slutshole Lane	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site not suitable for development as would lead to loss rural character and intrude into open countryside	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Footway provision may be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site is excessive in scale but it could be reduced in size to accommodate an appropriately sized allocation. The site has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings. The site is remote from the main areas of the settlement resulting in poor connectivity of the site. Potential loss of trees and hedgerows along the boundaries to create an access into the site would result in landscape harm.

**Site Visit Observations** Bunwell Road has a rural character south of its junction with Hill Road with only sporadic development which this development is at the southern extent of. Development of the site would erode that rural character resulting in an urbanising effect and would also protrude into the open countryside to the south.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting LP designations

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available.

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

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is an UNREASONABLE site for allocation and has also been assessed as an UNREASONABLE extension to the settlement limits. The site is excessive in scale but has been promoted for a small number of dwellings. The site is detached from the settlement and is poorly connected. Development of the site at any scale would result in an intrusion into the rural landscape. Development of the site would also result in the loss of the frontage trees and hedgerows, altering the rural approach towards the settlement.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020