

Tacolneston & Forncett End
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

Contents

SN0016REV.....	3
SN0084.....	11
SN0086.....	19
SN0089.....	27
SN0094.....	34
SN0602.....	42
SN1057.....	49
SN2013.....	57
SN2031.....	65
SN4019.....	73
SN4061SL.....	80
SN4062SL.....	87

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0016REV
Site address	Land to the rear of 122 Norwich Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2014/1959 - 2 new dwellings and detached garage – Withdrawn 2020/0048 - 1 new self-build dwelling - Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.95ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Settlement limit extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	1dph (24 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Access is available from Norwich Road.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red Unlikely satisfactory visibility (2.4m x 90m) could be provided at access. Footway improvement to min 2.0m width required between site and school.</p>	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	<p>Primary school – site is located less than 100m from the primary school.</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway – site is adjacent to The Pelican Public House	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste-water infrastructure should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that there is mains water, electricity available to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known ground stability or contamination issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1. LLFA – no comments	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	x
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Grade 3 agricultural land Site is surrounded by existing trees and hedgerow which limit wider views.	Amber

Townscape	Amber	This site would introduce development to the rear of properties on Norwich Road which would not reflect the form and character of this part of Tacolneston. This is also within the conservation area. It may be possible to mitigate this through careful design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Site is in close proximity to Hill Cottage and Saffron Cottage both of which are Grade II listed. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Surrounding road network is suitable. NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber Unlikely satisfactory visibility (2.4m x 90m) could be provided at access. Footway improvement to min 2.0m width required between site and school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site forms part of the setting of the listed buildings to the south. Development is considered to result in harm to the setting and their significance.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available from Norwich road.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Garden land associated with 122 Norwich Road.	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and also the Pelican Public House.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is generally flat. It slopes up from the road.	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundary treatments comprise a hedge to the front/west and a 1.5m high hedge and close boarded wooden fence of the same height on the northern boundary. The southern boundary is open to the existing garden.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	There are existing trees on the site and along the eastern 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	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are reduced by the existing hedgerow at the front of the site.	

<p>Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>Development of the site would impact on the setting and significance of the listed buildings and conservation area. The traditional verdant setting of the group of dwellings at number 116 and 122 Norwich Road will not be preserved as a result of the reduction in the size of the curtilage at number 122. This formed a reason for refusal of the most recent planning application and is considered to remain relevant.</p>	<p>Red</p>
---	---	------------

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Article 4 Direction		
Conservation Area		
Conclusion		Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	x	Green
	Within 5 years		
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		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>	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes. Widening of the site frontage footway up to the adjacent school would be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but not provided supporting information at this time	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site has been submitted for consideration as an extension to the existing settlement limit but would be of suitable size for an allocation. The site is adjacent to the existing settlement limit. The site is within the Conservation Area and adjacent to Listed Buildings (located to the south of the site). An Article 4 Direction is also in place. Townscape, landscape and highways concerns have all been identified.

Site Visit Observations Development would impact on the historic environment and is not considered reasonable for development. Potential highways issues.

Local Plan Designations Site is in the conservation area and has an article 4 direction.

Availability Promoter has confirmed that the site is available.

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is an UNREASONABLE site for both allocation and extension to the settlement limit because development would impact on the setting and significance of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Area. The traditional verdant setting of the group of dwellings at number 116 and 122 Norwich Road will not be preserved as a result of the reduction in the size of the curtilage at number 122. It is unlikely satisfactory visibility could be provided at access, particularly to on-coming traffic and footway improvement to min 2.0m width would be required between site and school. Any removal of hedging to achieve highway requirements would be detrimental to the heritage assets.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 8 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0084
Site address	Horse Meadow, Talconeston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	7.1ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph (178 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access from either Chenerys Lane or The Poplars.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. Access onto Cheney's Lane would require carriageway widening to 5.5m, frontage footway and removal of existing hedges. Wider network limited in width and lacks footway. Visibility limited at Cheney's Lane/ Norwich Road junction. The Poplars/Bentley Road unsuitable to provide access. No continuous footway to catchment school.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Primary school – 900m from site if accessed via The Cheney's</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste- water capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	The promoter has confirmed that there is mains water and electricity available to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known ground contamination or stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	x
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Grade 3 Agricultural land Hedgerows runs along the northern boundary of the site. There are open views across the site. The existing built form to the west is screened by hedgerows and trees Development is considered to have a detrimental impact on the landscape.	Red

Townscape	Amber	Development on this field would extend residential development to the east which would represent a break out. This would be detrimental to the existing development pattern.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain. Adjacent to priority habitat.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	There are a number of listed buildings located to the west of the site. The impact of the development could be mitigated through careful design. HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site will not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Cheney's Lane is restricted width without passing places and not considered suitable for additional traffic. Access can also be achieved from The Poplars. The local road network in this area is wider. NCC Highways – Red. Access onto Cheney's Lane would require carriageway widening to 5.5m, frontage footway and removal of existing hedges. Wider network limited in width and lacks footway. Visibility limited at Cheney's Lane/ Norwich Road junction. The Poplars/Bentley Road unsuitable to provide access. No continuous footway to catchment school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	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 represent a breakout of residential use to the east of the settlement. Development would harm the townscape.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available from Chenery Lane, however this is restricted width with no passing places or footpaths and not considered suitable. Access is also available from The Poplars however it is not clear if this would require third party land.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is flat. It is higher than Chenery Lane.	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	There are hedgerows surrounding the site.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerows at the 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)	Electricity lines run across the site.	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across the site. Views into the site are restricted	

Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would represent a break-out to the east of Tacolneston which would be detrimental to the landscape and townscape. In addition, access from Chenery lane is not considered be suitable, and it is unclear if access can be achieved from the Poplars.	Red
--	--	-----

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site is excessive in scale but could be reduced in size to meet the objectives of the VCHAP. Development of the site would break out to the east of the existing settlement and would have a townscape impact. Landscape concerns have also been identified. Highway constraints have also been identified.

Site Visit Observations Development of the site would impact on the landscape and townscape. Chenery Lane would not be suitable for an intensification of traffic.

Local Plan Designations Site is in the open countryside and adjacent the defined development boundary.

Availability Promoter has confirmed that the site is available.

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered UNREASONABLE for allocation. As promoted the site is excessive scale in scale but it could be reduced in size. Development of the site would represent a significant break out to the east of Tacolneston which would be detrimental to the landscape and townscape. In addition, there is no continuous footway to catchment school and access from Chenery lane is not considered to be suitable as it is unclear if access can be achieved from the Poplars. It would require carriageway widening to 5.5m, a frontage footway and removal of existing hedges which would have a negative impact on the landscape.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0086
Site address	Land north of Common Road, Forncett End
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.05ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25dph would equate to 26 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Common Road is narrow and includes passing places. Land allocated to the north is within the same ownership and may provide a suitable access. Applicant should confirm.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. Access achievable at Common Rd subject to providing acceptable visibility, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway, likely to require removal of frontage hedge/trees. Not feasible to provide footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road/Norwich 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	Primary school – 1.5km from the site – the first 300m does not have a footpath Public transport provision with a service to Norwich	
		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste water infrastructure should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed water and electricity are available at the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1. LLFA – Few if any constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage. No areas of surface water risk identified on this site as shown in the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. Watercourse not apparent.	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	

SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Tributary Farmland with Parkland		
		Settled Plateau Farmland		
		Plateau Farmland	x	
		Valley Urban Fringe		
		Fringe Farmland		
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland		
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Grade 3 agricultural land Development of the site would breakout into an undeveloped area of countryside which would have a detrimental impact upon the landscape. Appropriate landscaping may mitigate this.		Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would breakout into an undeveloped area of countryside which would have a detrimental impact on the townscape. Appropriate landscaping may mitigate this.		Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.		Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not impact on the historic environment. HES - Amber		Green

Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Common Road is narrow and includes passing places. Consideration should be given to access via the allocated site to the north. NCC Highways – Red. Access achievable at Common Rd subject to providing acceptable visibility, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway, likely to require removal of frontage hedge/trees. Not feasible to provide footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road / Norwich Road junction.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural	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 represent a break out to the south of the village which would not reflect the built form as currently developed.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is from Common Road. There are no footpaths and the road is narrow with no formal passing places	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural, land to the north is part of allocation TAC1.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows to both the north and south of the site	

Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	The site is highly visible within the landscape and development would have a detrimental impact	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are open views both across the site and into the site	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape by virtue of its location detached from the existing built form, however note existing allocation TAC01 (2017/0225) immediately to the north. Access via Common Road may be problematic.	Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Conclusion	No conflicting designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	X	Green
	Within 5 years		
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		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>	Promoter has confirmed deliverability	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 highways improvements may be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed viability but not submitted additional evidence	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site is of a suitable size for allocation. The site relates reasonably well to the settlement and is in close proximity to previous allocation TAC01 (2017/0225). As a standalone site it would represent a breakout into the countryside and would appear detached in the landscape. Highways and landscape concerns have been identified.

Site Visit Observations Site is detached from the settlement and would represent an extension into the open countryside. Common Road is narrow.

Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations

Availability Promoter has advised that the site is available

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is UNREASONABLE for allocation by virtue of its separation from the existing built form. Development would be an encroachment into the countryside and would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape. Access could be achievable at Common Rd but given the narrow width of the road it would require carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway. This would require the removal of frontage hedge/trees which would further impact on the landscape. It is not feasible to provide a footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road/Norwich Road junction. Possibility of surface water flooding as there is a small area of ponding in the southeast but it is unlikely to prevent development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0089
Site address	Land south of Common Road, Forncett End
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.93ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25dph would equate to 98 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access is available from Common Road which is narrow.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. Access achievable at Common Rd subject to providing acceptable visibility, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway, likely to require removal of frontage hedge/trees. Not feasible to provide footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road/ Norwich Road junction.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Primary school – 1.5km from the site – the first 300m does not have a footpath</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste-water infrastructure should be confirmed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed water and electricity are available at the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	x
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Grade 3 agricultural land Development of the site would represent a significant breakout into an undeveloped area of countryside which would have a detrimental impact on the landscape.	Red
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would breakout into an undeveloped area of countryside which would have a detrimental impact on the townscape	Red

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not impact on the historic environment. HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	The surrounding road network is narrow. Common Road includes informal passing places. NCC Highways – Red. Access achievable at Common Rd subject to providing acceptable visibility, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway, likely to require removal of frontage hedge/trees. Not feasible to provide footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road / Norwich Road junction.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/allotments	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 represent a break-out to the south of the village which would not reflect the built form.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is from Common Road. There are no footpaths and the road is narrow with no formal passing places	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural	

What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat, site slopes to the south	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows to both the north and south of the site	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	The site is highly visible within the landscape and development would have a detrimental impact	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are open views both across the site and into the site	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape by virtue of its location detached from the existing built form. Common Road may not be suitable for increased traffic.	Red

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Promoter has confirmed deliverability	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 highways improvements may be required to Common Road	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed viability but not submitted supporting evidence	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site is excessive in scale but could be reduced in size to meet the objectives of the VCHAP. The site is reasonably well located but would represent a breakout into the countryside to both the south and west of the existing built form. Highways, landscape and townscape concerns have been identified.

Site Visit Observations The site is detached from the settlement and would represent an extension into the open countryside. Development of the site would be detrimental to the landscape and it is not considered could not easily be mitigated. Common Road is narrow.

Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations

Availability Promoter has advised that the site is available.

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Development of the site is UNREASONABLE as it would be a significant breakout to the south of the existing village. The site is excessive in scale but could be reduced in size however development on this site would be detrimental to the landscape and townscape. Furthermore, access is likely to require removal of frontage hedge/trees. It is not feasible to provide footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road/Norwich Road junction.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 26 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0094
Site address	Land north of Norwich Road, Forncett End
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.1ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25dph would equate to 27 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access to the site is via Common road which is restricted width and does not have public footpaths.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Amber. Site located at Forncett End. Access achievable at Common Rd subject to providing acceptable visibility, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway, likely to require removal of frontage hedge/trees. Not feasible to provide footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road/Norwich Road junction.</p>	Amber

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	Amber	Primary school – 1.5km from the site – the first 300m does not have a footpath Public transport provision with a service to Norwich	
		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter has confirmed water and electricity are available at the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface water flood zone along the eastern boundary of the site. LLFA – Few if any constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage. There is a small area of ponding in the southeast of the site for the 0.1% event as shown on the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. No watercourse apparent.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	x
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (Land Use Consultants 2001)		E1: Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Grade 3 agricultural land Development of the site would breakout into an undeveloped area of countryside which would have a detrimental impact upon the landscape. Appropriate landscaping may mitigate this.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would breakout into an undeveloped area of countryside but appropriate landscaping may mitigate this. Development is immediately south of previous allocation TAC01 (2017/0225).	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not impact on the historic environment. HES - Amber	Green

Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Common Road is narrow and includes passing places. Consideration should be given to access via the allocated site to the north.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Red. Site located at Forncett End. Access achievable at Common Rd subject to providing acceptable visibility, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway, likely to require removal of frontage hedge/trees. Not feasible to provide footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road / Norwich Road junction.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural	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 represent a break-out to the south of the village which would not reflect the built form but it is adjacent to 2017/0225	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is from Common Road. There are no footpaths and the road is narrow with no formal passing places. Opportunity to access via site to the north?	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	

What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows to both the north and south of the site	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	The site is visible within the landscape and development but will be adjacent to a new development	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are open views both across the site and into the site	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape by virtue of its location detached from the existing built form(although note existing pp to the north). Access via Common Road may be problematic.	Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	x
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	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>	Promoter has confirmed the site is deliverable	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 highways improvements may be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed the site is viable but has not provided evidence at this time	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site is of suitable size for allocation. The site is adjacent to a previous allocation which has the benefit of planning permission but would be a breakout further south into the countryside. The site is adjacent to the existing settlement boundary and townscape concerns could potentially be mitigated. Landscape and highway concerns have been identified.

Site Visit Observations Site is detached from the settlement and would represent an extension into the open countryside. Development of the site would be detrimental to the landscape Common Road is constrained.

Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations

Availability Promoter has advised that the site is available

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is unreasonable for allocation as development would be an encroachment into the countryside and have a detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape. Access could be achievable at Common Rd but given the narrow width of the road it would require carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway. This would require the removal of frontage hedge/trees which would further impact on the landscape. It is not feasible to provide a footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road/Norwich Road junction. There is the possibility of surface water flooding as there is a small area of ponding in the southeast but it is unlikely to prevent development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0602
Site address	Land off The Fields, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated, adjacent land allocated previously
Planning History	Adjacent land subject to Outline planning approval – 2017/0225 Residential Development for 21 dwellings and open space. Extant - expires 30/11/21.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.55ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25 dph (14 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Access available from The Fields. This would need to be shared with the adjacent allocation. NCC should confirm number of houses which can access from single access.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. No identifiable means of access to the site.</p> <p>Highways Meeting: to be accessed via the current permission, which would be acceptable.</p>	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	<p>Primary school – 1.3km from the site</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p>	

<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Waste-water capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that there is mains water, sewerage and electricity supply to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known ground stability or contamination issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. LFFA – Green. Few or no constraints	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	x
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1: Ashwellthorpe Farmland	

Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Grade 3 agricultural land</p> <p>The site is relatively contained with existing hedgerows. It is well related to existing development and development is not considered to result in an adverse landscape impact.</p> <p>SNC Landscape Officer - appropriate in the context of approved scheme; would read against the settlement.</p>	Green
Townscape	Green	<p>The site forms part of a wider agricultural field however the remainder of the field has previously been allocated. The proposal would not extend the built form beyond existing residential development.</p> <p>SNC Heritage & Design Officer – no objections.</p>	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>The proposal is not considered to have an adverse impact on the historic environment</p> <p>HES – Amber</p> <p>SNC Heritage & Design Officer – no objections.</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	<p>Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space</p>	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>No issues identified with the local road network.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. No identifiable means of access to the site.</p> <p>Highways Meeting: to be accessed via the current permission, which would be acceptable.</p>	Red

Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green
------------------------	-------	------------------------------	-------

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would not extend the built form beyond the existing development to the south or the west	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would need to be from The Fields. Highways should confirm the number of dwellings which can be accessed from this single point.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site is part of a wider field which includes the existing allocation TAC1. There are no boundaries between the two. There are hedgerows surrounding the site.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site is relatively contained. Development would have limited impact on the landscape.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across the site. Site is visible from Common road	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Visually contained. Development is adjacent to existing residential, a suitable design solution would be feasible to prevent harm to residential amenity. Site is considered a suitable option for development.	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)
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green

Are on-site/off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unlikely	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but has not provided additional evidence at this time	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability Development would not extend the built form beyond the existing allocation. Access would need to be from The Fields. Visually contained. Development is adjacent to existing residential, a suitable design solution would be feasible to prevent harm to residential amenity. Site is considered a suitable option for development. Subject to a combined application included TAC1 the site is considered to be a suitable option for residential development.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Site is adjacent to existing residential development and would represent a suitable option for a further extension to the development boundary. Highways should confirm the number of dwellings which would be able to access the site from The Fields.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Site is adjacent to the existing allocation. No conflicting LP designations.</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised that the site is available within the plan period. No additional constraints identified</p> <p>Achievability No additional constraints identified</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be a REASONABLE site for allocation. It is adjacent to the settlement limits and an extant residential permission. It is well related to existing residential development and would have a limited impact of the landscape as it is contained by a western and southern boundary line. It could come forward as a comprehensive scheme with the existing allocation. Access should be from The Fields to the north, via the extant permission.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Yes Rejected:</p>

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN1057
Site address	Land to the west of Norwich Road, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2016/2635 – 3 self-build plots at front of site adjacent Norwich Road – Outline allowed at appeal - extant permission 10/05/21. Only small part of site.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.2ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph (80 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Predominantly greenfield – part brownfield as the site includes a dwelling and buildings associated with Hill Top Farm

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access to the site is available from Norwich Road.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. Access likely to require removal of frontage hedge. Subject to 2m wide frontage footway (linking to existing provision to the north) along with suitable crossing to existing facility at east side of Norwich Road.</p> <p>NCC Meeting: Considered difficult to provide a satisfactory access without losing trees and hedges, particularly if a footway is to be provided on the west side of Norwich Road. Would potentially need a crossing facility to the school – which would help provide a speed calming measure.</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	Primary school – 190m from the site Public transport provision with a service to Norwich	
		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste-water infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that mains water, sewerage and electricity are available to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1 LFFA – Green. Few or no constraints	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	x
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1: Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Grade 3 agricultural land Development would represent a breakout to the west of the village. This would have a negative impact on the landscape It is not considered that this could be mitigated. SDC Landscape Officer - Impact on townscape through eroding significant gap/green lung between two distinct parts of the settlement.	Red
Townscape	Amber	Development of the site would represent a break-out to the west of the village and not reflect the existing pattern of development. The proposal is considered to have a negative impact on the townscape which is not considered can be reasonably mitigated through design.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development would be reasonably mitigated – note ponds on existing residential site NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain. Need to maintain pond connectivity.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	The proposal is not considered to impact on the historic environment. HES - Amber	Green

Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of designated open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Access would be from the B1113. There are existing footpaths on the opposite side of Norwich Road.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. Access likely to require removal of frontage hedge. Subject to 2m wide frontage footway (linking to existing provision to the north) along with suitable crossing to existing facility at east side of Norwich Road.</p> <p>NCC Meeting: Considered difficult to provide a satisfactory access without losing trees and hedges, particularly if a footway is to be provided on the west side of Norwich Road. Would potentially need a crossing facility to the school – which would help provide a speed calming measure.</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 of the site would result in the break-out of development to the west of Tacolneston which does not reflect the form and character of the area. Development of the site would erode a clear gap between the two sections of the settlement.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available from Norwich Road	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural. There are a number of existing farm buildings within the site.	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	

What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	The western boundary includes a hedgerow adjacent to the public footpath.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	The site is open with views across it. There are significant trees located within the centre of the site which are visible within the landscape. The proposal will result in a break-out of development which would negatively impact on the landscape.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Electricity and telephone wires cross part of the site connecting the existing buildings	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are open views both within the site and across it to the west.	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would negatively impact on both the landscape and townscape.	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)
TPO	At front of site adjacent to Norwich road	
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	x	Green
	Within 5 years		
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		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>	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Footway required on the west side of Norwich Road and would potentially need a crossing facility to the school	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but has not provided additional supporting evidence at this time.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	An area of public parkland is proposed to the south-east of the site	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site is considered to be excessive in scale but could be reduced in size to meet the objectives of the VCHAP. The site is located within a gap between two distinctly separate sections of the settlement and would result in the loss of a significant green gap in the townscape. Townscape, landscape and highways concerns have been raised and TPOs are noted along the site frontage.

Site Visit Observations The site provides open views across the wider countryside. Development would result in a break-out to the west which would not reflect the form and character of the area and negatively impact on the landscape and townscape. It is not considered that this could be mitigated through design.

Local Plan Designations There are no conflicting LP designations

Availability Promoter has advised that the site is available within the plan period.

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is excessive in scale but could be reduced in size to meet the objectives of the VCHAP. The site is within a sustainable location and relates well to existing development to the north of the settlement. Development of the site would be limited to the top section of the site only in order to reduce the landscape and townscape impact of new development in this location. Creation of an adequate access would require the removal of existing vegetation and trees along the site frontage and some additional highways safety works may be required to support the development of this site. The trees at the front of the site are subject to TPOs. Consideration would need to be given to the form of development on this site.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2013
Site address	Land at Black Barn, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2003/2387 Black Barn – Change of use from photographic studio to residential dwelling - Approved
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1ha
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for up to 5 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25 dwellings at 25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access to the site is from Tabernacle Lane. The lane in this area is narrow and highways improvements would be required. Furthermore, the footpath on Tabernacle Lane does not extend as far as this site.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Unlikely to be able to provide acceptable access/visibility with limited frontage and due to adjacent hedge/narrow carriageway. Would require improvement scheme to provide 5.5m carriageway and 2.0m footway between site access and Long Stratton Road. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.</p>	Red

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Primary school – 1.8 km from the site – part of this route does not include a footpath Public transport provision with a service to Norwich	
		Facilities available within Tacolneston including: Village hall recreation ground, 2 public houses and a takeaway. There is no footway provision to these services	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste-water infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that mains water, sewerage and electricity are available at the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	1 in 1000 year surface water flooding within the site. 1 in 100 year surface water flooding along the road.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	x
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Grade 3 agricultural land Development of the site would impact upon the landscape.	Amber
Townscape	Red	Development of this site would result in harm to the townscape in this location which could not reasonably be mitigated.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Granville Farmhouse is located to the south of the site which is grade II listed. Black Barn is considered to be curtilage listed. Development of the site would impact on the setting of the designated heritage assets and it is not considered that the benefits of the proposal would outweigh this harm. HES - Amber	Red
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Tabernacle Lane at the entrance of this site is narrow. Improvements would be required. NCC Highways – Amber. Unlikely to be able to provide acceptable access/visibility with limited frontage and due to adjacent hedge/narrow carriageway. Would require improvement scheme to provide 5.5m carriageway and 2.0m footway between site access and Long Stratton Road. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.	Amber

Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential	Green
------------------------	-------	-------------	-------

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site would represent a break-out of development which does not reflect the existing townscape. The site would also impact the setting of Granville Farmhouse (LB).	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is from Tabernacle Lane. The land is not considered suitable for increased vehicular movements due to its restricted width and no footpaths	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and Residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Significant trees on all site boundaries screen the site from the wider view	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant trees on all site boundaries screen the site from the wider view	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views into or out of the site due to existing screening	

Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is not considered suitable for development due to location, access, and impact on the historic environment/townscape	Red
--	---	-----

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

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>	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Would require improvement scheme to provide 5.5m carriageway and 2.0m footway between site access and Long Stratton Road.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but has not provided any supporting evidence.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site is of a suitable size for allocation but has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings so would be more appropriately considered as a settlement limit extension. The site would represent a break-out of development which does not reflect the existing townscape. The site would be in close proximity to Granville Farmhouse (a listed building). Highways constraints and landscape concerns have been identified.

Site Visit Observations Site is screened from the wider landscape. Its detached in form.

Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations.

Availability The promoter has confirmed that the site is available.

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE as both an extension to the settlement limit and an allocation. The site is detached from the existing built form and would represent a breakout, which does not reflect the existing townscape. The access and local road network along Tabernacle Lane is also not considered to be suitable for increased traffic by virtue of its restricted width and lack of footpaths and passing places. Unlikely to be able to provide acceptable access visibility with limited frontage and due to adjacent hedge/narrow carriageway. Development of the site would negatively impact on the setting of the designated heritage assets and it is not considered that the benefits of the proposal would outweigh this harm.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 8 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2031
Site address	Land east of Norwich Road, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2018/1346 – One self-build dwelling - Withdrawn
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.25ha
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph (31 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Access is available from Norwich Road.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Amber Subject to widening the frontage footway to 2m. Like to require removal of frontage hedge.</p> <p>Highways Meeting - Issues with substantial tree and hedge removal and together with SN1057 these form a significant green break between two parts of the village. Forward visibility issues to the south along bend.</p>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	<p>Primary school – 350m from the site</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	The promoter has confirmed that there is mains water, sewerage and electricity available to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known ground stability or contamination issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1. A surface water flow path runs along the south of the site. The 1 in 1000 year event extends into the centre of the site significantly reducing the developable area.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	x
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1: Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	

Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Grade 3 agricultural land. PROW Tacolneston FP9 runs to the south of the site and across the south-eastern corner, connecting to a wider footpath network.</p> <p>There is an existing hedgerow along the front of the site.</p> <p>SNC Landscape Officer - lots of roadside vegetation, including some significant oaks and ash trees; the hedgerow along the roadside has been neglected in recent years; the vegetation provides a green lung between the two groups of development, reinforcing the rural character.</p>	Red
Townscape	Green	Site is well related to other residential development	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>Any impacts of development can be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>A listed building is located to the south of the site. This is set within a reasonable sized plot. Subject to an appropriate design, it is considered that the impact could be mitigated.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber

Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Access is from the B1113. There is an existing footpath along the site frontage.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Green. Subject to widening the frontage footway to 2m. Like to require removal of frontage hedge.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Issues with substantial tree and hedge removal and together with SN1057 these form a significant green break between two parts of the village. Forward visibility issues to the south along bend.</p>	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is relatively contained. Listed buildings are located to the south of the site however the impact of the development could be reduced through suitable design solutions.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would be from Norwich Road however would require the removal of trees and hedgerow	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site is generally flat but it slopes towards the southwestern corner.	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site is bounded by hedgerows Public footpath is located to the south of the site	

Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	There are oak trees at the front of the site which support the verdant rural characteristic of this part of Talconeston	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	A sewerage pumping station is located in the south-eastern corner of the site. This would reduce the developable area of the site. Electricity power lines cross the site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are restricted by the existing boundary treatments	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would require the loss of significant trees along the western boundary of the site to provide access and suitable visibility splays, this would impact on the 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)
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	x	Green
	Within 5 years		
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		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>	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Improvements to achieve access visibility.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but not provided additional supporting evidence at this time	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site exceeds the objectives of the VCHAP however identified flood risk to the south of the site would reduce the developable area. The site is adjacent to existing built form and relatively well contained. Development of the site would require the loss of significant trees along the western boundary of the site to provide access and suitable visibility splays and this would significantly impact on the landscape.

Site Visit Observations There is an existing footpath along the front of the site however, to achieve a suitable access a number of trees at the front of the site would need to be removed. This would impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations

Availability Promoter has advised that the site is available

Achievability The promoter has advised that the site is achievable however constraints to the size of the site by virtue of the areas of surface water flood risk, the presence of the sewerage pumping station and the overhead electricity power lines have been identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is UNREASONABLE for allocation. Whilst it is well located adjacent to the development boundary access it would have a negative impact on the landscape. It would require the loss of significant trees and hedgerow which create the rural character of this part of Tacolneston and form a significant green break between two parts of the village. There are forward visibility issues to the south along the bend and a surface water flow path runs along the south of the site. These constraints significantly reduce the developable site area.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 25 November

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4019
Site address	Land to the south of Hall Road, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1ha
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph (25 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access to the site is from Hall Road. This is of restricted width. NCC Highways – Red. Substandard highway network. No safe walking route.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities	Green	Primary school – 140m from the site but there are no public footpaths Public transport provision with a service to Norwich	
<i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport			
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green

Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that there is mains water, sewerage and electricity to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known ground stability or contamination issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Site is in flood zone 1. There is an area of surface water flood risk at the north of the site adjacent to Hall Road. Due to the size of the site it may be possible to mitigate this. LLFA – Surface water flooding but would not prevent development. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	x
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1: Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Grade 3 agricultural land There are currently open views across the site from Hall Road. Development would impact upon the wider landscape	Red
Townscape	Amber	Development would represent a breakout to the north east and backland development.	Amber

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could reasonably be mitigated. NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and also 103 Norwich Road which is Grade II listed. Development of the site would impact views of the CA from Norwich Road. This may be mitigated through an appropriate design solution. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	Hall Road is of restricted width. The trees at the front of the site are subject to a TPO woodland order and it is not considered possible to mitigate the road width. NCC Highways – Red. Substandard highway network. No safe walking route.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural land	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	103 Norwich Road located to the north east of the site. Visible from the site.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would be via Hall Lane. This is narrow single car width with no passing places. The access is not considered suitable.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties are located to the east of the site. Land to the west is in agricultural use	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	The northern boundary is tree lined and includes a woodland TPO. There is a hedgerow to the south. There is no western boundary as this forms part of a wider agricultural field.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Access to the site would impact on trees to the north of the site.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Electricity power lines cross the site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are screened by the existing trees. There are open views across the site.	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would impact on the landscape representing a breakout of development to the north west of the village. It is not considered that this can be mitigated through design. Furthermore, the access is not considered to be suitable.	Red

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Off-site highways improvements would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but no additional evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site is of a suitable size for allocation and is adjacent to the development boundary. An area of TPO woodland is located adjacent to the north east of the site. Access to the site is not considered to be appropriate via Hall Road. Development of the site would result in a backland form of development and would impact on the landscape representing a break-out to the north west of the village.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Hall Road is not a suitable option for access. The road is of restricted width and access would result in the loss of trees. These support the verdant rural character of the site. Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within the plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified</p> <p>Achievability No additional constraints identified</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is an UNREASONABLE site for allocation due to the detrimental impacts on the landscape and townscape. Development of the site would be a significant extension into the countryside which would not reflect the existing form of the settlement on this side of Norwich Road. It would negatively impact on the adjacent Conservation Area and Woodland TPO. Access is also not considered to be suitable as Hall Road is substandard, there is no safe walking route and visibility splays would require the removal of important countryside trees/hedging.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4061SL
Site address	The Pelican, 136 Norwich Road, Talconeston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2018/2645 - Erection of 2 dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping - Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.2ha
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	SL Extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25 dph (5 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Access is available from Norwich road.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. Subject to 90m x 2.4m x 90m visibility splays and provision of 2.0m footway for full extent of frontage, with improvement to existing footway to 2.0m between site and school.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	<p>Primary school – 170m from the site</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p> <p>Nearest GP service and retail offer is in Long Stratton</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste-water capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that water and electricity are available to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known ground stability or contamination issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	1 in 1000 year surface water flood risk located across the centre of the site. LLFA – Surface water flooding but would not prevent development. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	x
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	

Overall Landscape Assessment		Grade 3 agricultural land Site is surrounded by existing trees and hedgerow which limit wider views.	
Townscape	Amber	This site would introduce development to the rear of properties on Norwich Road which would not reflect the form and character of this part of Tacolneston. This is also within the conservation area. It may be possible to mitigate this through careful design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	The site is located within the conservation area and within the setting of The Pelican PH which is Grade II listed. New dwellings in this location will contribute towards eroding the open space behind the properties on Norwich Road and will cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Surrounding road network is suitable. NCC Highways – Amber. Subject to 90m x 2.4m x 90m visibility splays and provision of 2.0m footway for full extent of frontage, with improvement to existing footway to 2.0m between site and school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and public house	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site is located within the conservation area and also forms part of the setting of The Pelican public house which is grade II listed. Development would have a significant impact on both the townscape and historic environment.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available from Norwich Road.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Pub garden	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Public house and residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Existing trees are located along and adjacent to the side and rear boundaries.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Existing trees are located along and adjacent to the side and rear 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	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are available from Norwich Road.	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would erode the open space to the rear of numbers 126 to 134 Norwich Road and The Pelican public house. This is considered to result in harm historic environment.	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)
Conservation Area		
Conclusion	Development would impact on the Conservation Area	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	The pub has been marketed for 30 months previously for sale as a pub/restaurant but has ceased trading. The site has been closed for nearly 3.5 years	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	x
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	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>	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Provision of 2.0m footway for full extent of frontage, improvement to existing footway to 2.0m between site and school	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but has not provided additional supporting evidence	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site is of a suitable size to be considered as an extension to the settlement limit. It would erode the open space to the rear of numbers 126 to 134 Norwich Road and The Pelican public house. It would also have a negative impact on the historic environment. Development of the site would result in the loss of the Public House as a community facility, however it is noted that there is another public house within the village and that this pub is currently closed.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Development of the site would impact on the setting and significance of designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Site is located within the conservation area and adjacent to listed buildings.</p> <p>Availability Site is available</p> <p>Achievability No additional constraints identified</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is UNREASONABLE as an extension to the settlement limit as it would not reflect the existing form and character of the immediate area and would result in harm to the historic environment. New dwellings in this location will contribute towards eroding the open space behind the properties on Norwich Road and will cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area and impact on the Grade II listed Pelican PH. It would require improvement to existing footway to 2.0m between site and school and visibility splays which would also have a negative impact on the historic environment. There is surface water flooding although it is unlikely to prevent development.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 8 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4062SL
Site address	The Pelican 136 Norwich Road, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2018/2645 - 2 dwellings - Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.45
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	SL Extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	16 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Pub is brownfield – Pub garden is greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Access is available from Norwich road.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Amber. Subject to 90m x 2.4m x 90m visibility splays and provision of 2.0m footway for full extent of frontage, with improvement to existing footway to 2.0m between site and school.</p> <p>Highways meeting: On a slope surrounding existing terrace properties. Concerns over visibility. Would not want to encourage an allocation but could accept a SL extension.</p>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	<p>Primary school – 170m from the site</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway – This proposal includes the conversion of one of the pubs.	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste-water capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that water and electricity are available to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known ground stability or contamination issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	1 in 1000 year surface water flood risk located across the centre of the site. LLFA – Surface water flooding but would not prevent development. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	x
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	

Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Grade agricultural land Site is surrounded by existing trees and hedgerow which limit wider views. SND Landscape Officer - recent refused Appeal decision on the site; landscape concerns about this site.	Red
Townscape	Amber	This site would introduce development to the rear of properties on Norwich Road which would not reflect the form and character of this part of Tacolneston. This is also within the conservation area. It may be possible to mitigate this through careful design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	The site is located within the conservation area and includes The Pelican PH which is Grade II listed. New dwellings in this location will contribute towards eroding the open space behind the properties on Norwich Road and will cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Heritage concerns. HES – Amber	Amber

Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Surrounding road network is suitable.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Amber. Subject to 90m x 2.4m x 90m visibility splays and provision of 2.0m footway for full extent of frontage, with improvement to existing footway to 2.0m between site and school.</p> <p>Highways meeting: On a slope surrounding existing terrace properties. Concerns over visibility. Would not want to encourage an allocation but could accept a SL extension.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site includes The Pelican public house and is located within the conservation area. Impact on both townscape and heritage assets.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available from Norwich Road.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Pub garden	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Public house and residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Existing trees are located along and adjacent to the side and rear boundaries.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Existing trees are located along and adjacent to the side and rear 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	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are available from Norwich Road.	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would erode the open space to the rear of numbers 126 to 134 Norwich Road and The Pelican public house. This is considered to result in harm historic environment.	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)
Conservation Area		
Listed Building		
Conclusion	Some potential conflicts with LP designations	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	The pub has been marketed for 30 months previously for sale as a pub/restaurant but has ceased trading. The site has been closed for nearly 3.5 years	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	x
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	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>	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Highway/footpath improvements.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but has not provided additional evidence at this time	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site is of a suitable size to be considered as an extension to the existing settlement limit. Development of the site would impact on the setting and significance of designated heritage assets. Development of the site would erode the open space to the rear of numbers 126 to 134 Norwich Road and The Pelican public house.

Site Visit Observations Development of the site would impact on the setting and significance of designated heritage assets.

Local Plan Designations Conservation area and listed buildings

Availability Site is available

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is UNREASONABLE as a settlement limit extension. Development of the site would be to the rear of numbers 126 to 134 Norwich Road and The Pelican public house which would not reflect the existing form and character. This will result in harm to the historic environment because it is located within the Conservation Area and would impact on The Pelican PH which is Grade II listed. It would require improvement to existing footway to 2.0m between site and school and visibility splays which would also have a negative impact on the historic environment.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 8 December 2020