

Thurlton & Norton Subcourse
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

Contents

SN0149	3
SN0309	13

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0149
Site address	Land adjacent to Holly Cottage, West of Beccles Road, Thurlton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2018/2594 O/L for up to 7 dwellings, drainage, external works and associated infrastructure. Withdrawn. 2018/2593 3 dwellings (additional plots 6-8)& garages. Withdrawn <u>Adjacent site (in SL)</u> 2016/2904 5 detached dwellings and garages. Full PP Approved. Included in SL: 1 built. 2011/0999 5 dwellings & garages and access road. Approved 1988/2247 3 Houses and Garages on Approved Building Plots (07/87/1253/O). Approved 1987/1253 Development of Site For 3 Building Plots with new Access to Existing Cottage from Beccles Road. Approved.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.51Ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approximately 15 dwellings – assume 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

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

Access to the site	Amber	<p>NCC Highways comments to 2018/2594 (comparable to the proposed site):</p> <p>The scale of development proposed would require an adoptable standard road.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has not demonstrated that adequate visibility splays can be provided at the junction with Beccles Road.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Amber. Access would need to demonstrate acceptable access visibility (2.4m x 59m) and adequate links to existing footways.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <p><i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	Green	<p>Village Shop 278m</p> <p>Bus stop within 89m is on the bus route for 86 traveline</p> <p>Primary School 809m</p>	
			<p>Village Hall and associated Recreational ground 497m</p> <p>Public House 572m</p>
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, sewage and electricity available to site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green

Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.</p> <p>NCC Minerals – site under 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood zone 1, Flood zones 2 and 3 lie close to western boundary where there is a surface water flow path. Surface Water flooding in the southern tip part of the site.</p> <p>LFFA – Few or no constraints. Some areas of surface water risk identified present in the 1:30, 1:100 and 1:1000 year rainfall events as identified on the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps in east of the site up to 0.6m in depth. Watercourse is apparent on DRN mapping to the West of the site (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). Surface water mapping is a proxy for flooding from the ordinary watercourse (fluvial not pluvial). Would recommend that development outside areas of flood risk is considered. Not served by AW connection. Part of the site is within the Waveney Lower Yare and Lothingland Internal Drainage Board.</p>	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	X	
		Settled Plateau Farmland		
		Plateau Farmland		
		Valley Urban Fringe		
		Fringe Farmland		
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 - Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland		
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated. Consideration needs to be given to the proximity to the Broads.</p> <p>SDC Landscape Officer - The site is well contained and screened and would be acceptable, however likely numbers achievable on the site could reduce the site to a SL extension rather than an allocation. Consideration to be given to the retention of existing vegetation.</p>	Amber	
Townscape	Green	<p>Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Adjacent to the development boundary and a small development of 5 dwellings which an access is proposed via. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site.</p>	Amber	

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Noted the proximity to the Broads.</p> <p>NCC Ecology – Green. Land adjacent to priority habitat - Good quality semi-improved grassland (Non Priority). SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Development would not have detrimental impact on setting of any of the LB located in the vicinity.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Highways have not raised an objection in terms of functioning of the local road network but adequate links to existing footways will need to be provided.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Amber. Access would need to demonstrate acceptable access visibility (2.4m x 59m) and adequate links to existing footways.</p> <p>Highways Meeting - Main issues are how they can access onto the Beccles Road; the access comes in at an angle – usually want it perpendicular to the road – however previous discussions relating to this site have suggested it is probably OK. Not acceptable to access from Sandy Lane.</p>	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Adjacent to the development boundary. The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	An adoptable estate road should be perpendicular to the existing highway for the first 15m, although for type 6 roads a minimum of 10.5m would be acceptable and the access would need to demonstrate acceptable access visibility (2.4m x 59m) and adequate links to existing footpaths	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural Grade 3	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural/residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Levels drop north to south and east to west.	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Southern boundary fronts Sandy Lane, northern part residential and part open fields, eastern residential boundaries, western open fields and southwest residential property.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant tree/hedgerow boundary to the southern tip/southeast Residential boundaries to the east and part of the north. Residential to the southwest and natural vegetation to the northwest and west	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	None	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Relatively contained, views glimpsed through the boundary with Sandy Lane	

<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>Adjacent to existing development boundary next to a smaller plot with planning permission for 5 dwellings. and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the west/southwest of the village.</p> <p>Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape and townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. A lower density would be required to enable the pond/surface water drainage at the southern end to be accommodated and to fit with the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>Access could only be achieved through the adjoining consented site</p> <p>Highways has not raised an objection in terms of functioning of the local road network but adequate links to existing footways will need to be provided.</p>	<p>Amber</p>
---	---	--------------

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site is considered suitable subject to mitigation of constraints, lower density and confirmation from NCC Highways that the site is acceptable in highway terms.

Site Visit Observations Adjacent to existing development boundary next to a smaller plot with planning permission for 5 dwellings and well related to services. It would however represent a breakout to the west/southwest of the village.

Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape and townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. A lower density would be required to enable the pond/surface water drainage at the southern end to be accommodated and to fit with the character and appearance of the area.

Access could only be achieved through the adjoining consented site

Highways have not raised an objection in terms of functioning of the local road network but adequate links to existing footways will need to be provided.

Local Plan Designations Within open countryside

Availability Promoter has advised availability immediately

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be a reasonable site for development. The adjoining site has a partially implemented planning permission within the current settlement limit. This site is an extension to that using the same access. It is within the village with good access to services and the school. It will have a limited impact on the landscape which can be mitigated. Drainage requirements and retention of trees to the south will determine density. Adequate access will need to be achieved for an increased number of dwellings utilising the approved access from Beccles Road through the adjacent site

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 26/01/2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0309
Site address	Land south of Loddon Road, Norton Subcourse
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.06ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Not specified (26dph)
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	NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The road has restricted forward visibility, it is unlikely satisfactory accesses could be achieved without setting the development back and removing banks & hedges to improve visibility along Loddon Road, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and frontage footway of 2.0m width would also be required.	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	Green	Village Shop 763m Bus stop within 455m on the bus route for 86 traveline Primary School 659m	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall and Recreational ground 545m Public House 472m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, sewage and electricity available to site. AW advise sewers cross this site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues. NCC Minerals - Site over 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Surface water flooding 1:00 through part of the site running north south, larger flow path 1:1000 across eastern part running north to south.	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	X
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Fringe Farmland	
		C2 - Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated.	
Townscape	Amber	<p>The site is located in a distinctly rural part of the District on the edge of Norton Subcourse. This part is characterised by a more linear form of development. Development boundary is located on the opposite side of the road and adjacent to the east.</p> <p>Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site, especially taking into consideration the constraints of the site with surface water flooding</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Noted the proximity to the Broads.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB. St Mary and St Margaret's Church Grade 1 listed building is located to the west of the site separated by Church Road	Amber

Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The road has restricted forward visibility, it is unlikely satisfactory accesses could be achieved without setting the development back and removing banks & hedges to improve visibility along Loddon Road, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and frontage footway of 2.0m width would also be required.	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?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LBs.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. The site is opposite and adjacent to the development boundary.</p>	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	<p>The road has restricted forward visibility, it is unlikely satisfactory accesses could be achieved without setting the development back and removing banks & hedges to improve visibility along Loddon Road, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and frontage footway of 2.0m width would also be required. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision.</p>	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural grade 3	

What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	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)	East and west residential, open to the south with natural hedge boundary with substantial trees to the north	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Substantial trees and hedgerow to the site frontage which, with the banks, will likely to need removing to provide visibility	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead lines north to south cutting across the site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site clearly visible from the surrounding road network and in views across the open countryside.	

<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>The site is located in a distinctly rural part of the District on the edge of Norton Subcourse. This part is characterised by a more linear form of development.</p> <p>This is a greenfield site with a long road frontage, opposite and adjacent to the existing development.</p> <p>It would represent a breakout to the west of the village. Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site, especially taking into consideration the constraints of the site with surface water flooding.</p> <p>Views of the sites are afforded from the surrounding road network and across the open landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.</p> <p>The proximity of the Broads and the presence of veteran trees and hedgerows are constraints of the site.</p> <p>Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB. St Mary and St Margaret's Church Grade 1 listed building is located to the west of the site separated by Church Road, especially in longer views.</p>	<p>Amber</p>
---	--	--------------

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability Not considered suitable, due to potential adverse impacts on Heritage assets, landscape and highway safety.

Site Visit Observations The site is located in a distinctly rural part of the District on the edge of Norton Subcourse. This part is characterised by a more linear form of development. This is a greenfield site with a long road frontage, opposite and adjacent to the existing development.

It would represent a breakout to the west of the village. Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site, especially taking into consideration the constraints of the site with surface water flooding.

Views of the sites are afforded from the surrounding road network and across the open landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

The proximity of the Broads and the presence of veteran trees and hedgerows are constraints.

Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB. St Mary and St Margaret's Church Grade 1 listed building is located to the west of the site separated by Church Road, especially in longer views.

Local Plan Designations Within open countryside

Availability Promoter has advised availability immediately

Achievability Overhead lines north to south cutting across the site

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be unreasonable. The site is adjacent to the settlement limit where development is characterised by a linear form of development. However, the site is out of scale with the village and would extend into the landscape elongating the village in wider views to the west with a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed church. There is no continuous footpath back to the village and there would not be a safe walking route to school. The constraints of the site in respect of the ditch and surface water flooding reduces the developable area and frontage hedging would have to be removed for access.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 26/01/2021