

Thurton & Ashby St Mary
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

Contents

SN0029	3
SN0470	10
SN0472	17
SN0585	24
SN2048	32
SN4008	39
SN4038	47
SN4039	55
SN4040	63

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0029
Site address	Land south of Vale Road, Thurton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.51 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	30 dph – approx. 45 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	Possibility of creating a suitable access is severely constrained CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Thurton school 300 metres away by A146 or 450 metres by Vale Road Peak time bus service passes site on A146 with nearest bus stop around 100 metres but with no connecting footway or 270 metres via Vale Road Employment site 200 metres away on opposite side of A146	
<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 		Distance to village hall and recreation space 450 metres by A146; 615 metres by Vale Road Distance to George and Dragon public house 215 metres by A146; 360 metres by Vale Road	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber

Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity supply are available. Query re. sewerage connection. AW advise sewers cross the site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues Minerals & Waste comment – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site becomes an allocation 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	No identified flood risk LLFA score (GNLP) – Green (standard information required). Access and egress to the site would need to be considered.	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland Agricultural land classification not clear	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Relatively contained by existing vegetation with limited impact on wider landscape.	Green

Townscape	Green	If access issues could be resolved then development of the site could be designed to relate to existing form of settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts could be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets affected HES Score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	If access can be provided then road network could be impacted CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Green
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 this site could round off the settlement without intruding into the wider landscape and relating to the existing form of the settlement. No impact on historic environment	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access directly onto A146 would not be acceptable. Plan shows small access from Vale Road however this is very constrained and is highly unlikely to be suitable to provide an adoptable access road.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential along northern boundary with agricultural land to the east. To the south on the opposite side of the A146 is further agricultural land	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Sites rises from north to south	

What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and some hedging along boundaries including with A146	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential impact on boundary trees and hedging. No ponds or watercourses.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views relatively contained into and out of site by boundary hedges and trees	
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)	Not likely to be suitable due to access constraint	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	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 ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Possible requirement for footway on A146 depending on how site was developed	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence	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 allocated however it is adjacent to a Principle Route (A146) which will impact on potential access arrangements. Some concerns identified about sewerage connections however it is possible that these could be addressed.

Site Visit Observations

Relatively well contained site that could be developed without intruding into the wider landscape. However access is unlikely to be achievable due to A146 frontage and insufficient narrow access from Vale Road.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is considered to be achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is relatively well contained and could be developed without intruding into the wider landscape. However, access onto A146, which is a Principle Route, would not be appropriate. Access from the narrow access via Vale Road does not appear to be feasible.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 30 June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0470
Site address	Land north of Vale Road, Thurton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.89 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	22 dph – up to 20 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	Constraints could be overcome NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access would require road widening to 5.5m, 2m wide footway and removal of existing tree. However, Vale Road is constrained at eastern extent of built area. Insufficient highway available to provide acceptable footway and carriageway widths. Development would increase the number of slowing, stopping and turning movements at inappropriate junction onto A146 Principal Route.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Thurton school 350 metres with footway Distance to peak time bus service 180 metres with footway Employment site 310 metres on other side of A146	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to village hall and recreation space 500 metres with footway Distance to George and Dragon public house 310 metres on other side of A146	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity infrastructure to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available. AW advise sewers crossing the site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some risk of surface water flooding on northern fringe of site, however this shouldn't infringe on the ability to develop the site LLFA score (GNLP) – Green (standard information required).	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (Land Use Consultants 2001)		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland No loss of high quality agricultural land	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Relatively contained in wider landscape but some local landscape impact that would need to be mitigated.	Amber

Townscape	Green	<p>Could relate to existing estate development to west of site, whilst matching existing extent of development on southern side of Vale Road</p> <p>Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. Potential townscape seems fine and fits in with settlement boundary to south of Vale Road. 20 dwellings seems quite a lot considering fitting in with the existing grain of development to the south – and building beings set back slightly from road as on village periphery to the village where you would not want a tight urban front. Suggesting scaling down numbers a little - 10-15?</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impact can be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No designated heritage assets affected</p> <p>Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Green</p> <p>HES Score – Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>HEELA – could be mitigated</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access would require road widening to 5.5m, 2m wide footway and removal of existing tree. However, Vale Road is constrained at eastern extent of built area. Insufficient highway available to provide acceptable footway and carriageway widths. Development would increase the number of slowing, stopping and turning movements at inappropriate junction onto A146 Principal Route.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site could be developed to suitably reflect character of existing development to west	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Suitable access should be achievable but need to confirm it can be achieved without loss of veteran trees on highway boundary	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural and with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to south and west, agricultural to north and east. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	No defined eastern boundary	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees to north and important veteran trees on highway boundary. Pond in remainder of field to east	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No likely contamination issues	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site visible from road and in views of settlement as approach along Vale Road from east	
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 could be acceptable as an allocation of up to 20 dwellings extending no further than the existing eastern extent of dwellings along the southern side of Vale Road. This is contingent on the veteran trees on the highway boundary being retained	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	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?	Single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		Green

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

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

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site is of sufficient size to be allocated however concerns have been raised about the scale of development proposed on the site. A number of constraints have been identified on the site including the presence of veteran trees on the site boundary and some associated landscape impacts.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Northern side of narrow country lane but footway along lane within settlement to west, whilst site does not extend any further into open countryside to east than development on southern side of road. However, there are a series of veteran trees along the highway boundary which need to be retained.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Outside but adjacent to development boundary.</p> <p>Availability Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p>Achievability Development of the site is achievable.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be unreasonable. Although adjacent to the existing settlement limit and in a sustainable location, the local road network is considered to be substandard and unable to accommodate further growth. Consideration would also need to be given to the impact of development on the local landscape, particularly on the existing trees.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 30 June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0472
Site address	Land south of Vale Road, Thurton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusal for one dwelling on site but no recent planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.92 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Up to 10 dwellings. <i>However, the site of sufficient size to allocate for at least 12 dwellings and has been considered as both a SL extension and an allocation site.</i>
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	13dph if developed for 12 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential access constraints could be overcome</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access would require road widening to 5.5m, 2m wide footway and removal of existing tree. However, Vale Road is constrained at eastern extent of built area. Insufficient highway available to provide acceptable footway and carriageway widths. Development would increase the number of slowing, stopping and turning movements at inappropriate junction onto A146 Principal Route and rat-running along adjacent narrow roads.</p>	Red

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> o Primary School o Secondary school o Local healthcare services o Retail services o Local employment opportunities o Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus o Village/ community hall o Public house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Green	Distance to Thurton school 450 metres Distance to peak time bus service 260 metres Employment area 300 metres away In all cases first 80 metres have no footway	
		Distance to village hall and recreation space 590 metres Distance to George and Dragon public house 350 metres In all cases first 80 metres have no footway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are available at the site. AW advise sewers cross the site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some risk of surface water flooding to north of site LLFA score (GNLP) – Green (standard information required). Access and egress to the site would need to be considered.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Significantly breaks out from existing settlement into wider landscape. No loss of high quality agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Linear development extending along southern side of Vale Road would relate to existing form of development	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impact can be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designed heritage assets in vicinity although Vale Farm could be considered a non-designated heritage asset HES Score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Local road network is constrained but mitigation may be possible NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access would require road widening to 5.5m, 2m wide footway and removal of existing tree. However, Vale Road is constrained at eastern extent of built area. Insufficient highway available to provide acceptable footway and carriageway widths. Development would increase the number of slowing, stopping and turning movements at inappropriate junction onto A146 Principal Route and rat-running along adjacent narrow roads.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Significantly breaks out from existing development into open countryside. Relationship with Vale Farm.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable although works to upgrade road to link to footway along Vale Road may be required, which could in turn require removal of veteran trees	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to north, east and south with residential to west. No compatibility issues.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is at higher level than Vale Road with steep bank between field and public highway	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Forms part of larger field so no defined southern boundary.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some trees and hedging which provides habitat. Also pond on northern side of Vale Road	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No known contamination issues	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Lack of containing features, including no defined southern boundary, means development would be apparent from public approaches from north and south	
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)	Not considered suitable for allocation due to intrusion into wider landscape to east of existing settlement, plus possible access issues that may require removal of veteran trees	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	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?	Single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

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

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Likely to require footway provision for 80 metres along Vale Road to connect to existing	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site is of a suitable size for allocation but has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings. Highways concerns have been identified including the ability of creating a safe access into the site and the impact of development on the A146, a Principal Route. Areas of flood risk have also been identified on the site, as well as a landscape impact due to the topography of the site.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Site protrudes beyond existing eastern extent of settlement and would be highly visible in local landscape. Also accessed by narrow country lane where upgrade work to provide footway likely to require loss of veteran trees</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Outside but adjacent to development boundary.</p> <p>Availability Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p>Achievability Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site has been considered as both an allocation and a settlement limit extension. Both forms of development are considered to have a detrimental impact on the landscape. Access constraints have also been identified.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 1 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0585
Site address	Land opposite Hill Farm Barn and Hill Top Barn, Mill Common, Ashby St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No recent planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.5 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Settlement limit extension for four dwellings <i>but due to its size the site could be considered as an allocation and has been assessed as both an allocation and an extension to the settlement limit</i>
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	8dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Red	<p>Possibility of creating suitable access to the site is severely constrained</p> <p>Highways score – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.</p>	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	<p>Distance to Thurton school 750 metres with no footways along Low Common</p> <p>Distance to peak time bus service 800 metres with no footways along Low Common</p> <p>Employment development on opposite side of A146 nearly 1km</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to village hall and recreation space Distance to George and Dragon public house on opposite side of A146 nearly 1km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that there are mains water, sewerage and electricity available.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	(No score)	No known contamination or ground stability issues Minerals & Waste – the site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site progresses as an allocation then future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, if the site area was amended to over 1ha, it should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Approach from Thurton is at high risk of surface water flooding	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is at higher level than road and therefore potentially quite prominent in local landscape. No loss of high quality agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Red	Sporadic development separated from main part of settlement	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impact can be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Red	No designated heritage assets in vicinity which any development of this would have adverse impact on HES Score – Red.	Red
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is inadequate and there are safety concerns identified from siting development on a bend NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	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 be on the opposite side of a narrow country lane from a collection of former farm buildings that can be considered a non-designated heritage asset. Any development of this site would adversely affect their setting. Furthermore, the site does not relate to the existing settlement.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential difficulties due to difference in levels in creating access whilst local highway network is very constrained	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Some residential to east and west with agricultural to north. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level difference between road and site that would make satisfactory development of site difficult	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Section of hedgerow on highway boundary. Other boundaries relatively open	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some habitat in hedging	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No likely contamination on site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views available across site from public highway and potentially from PROW to 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)	Not adjacent to existing development boundary, development of this would involve creation of new development boundary for small collection of dwellings with adverse impact on non-designated heritage assets and potential access issues	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	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?	Single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	The site has been under option to a developer since 2015		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	None identified at this stage	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	n/a	
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Site well removed from existing development boundary and existing services. Not suitable for settlement limit extension. Highways concerns have been identified, including impact of development in this location on the local highway network. Potential impact on the local landscape also identified.

Site Visit Observations

This site is removed from the main part of the settlement, along a narrow country lane with levels issues that would complicate development of the site and with adverse impact on setting of non-designated heritage assets.

Local Plan Designations

Outside and well removed from development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site has been considered as both a settlement limit extension and an allocation but is considered unreasonable for both. The site is removed from the main part of the settlement and located along a narrow country lane, resulting in a poor relationship to services. Development of the site would be expected to have an adverse impact on setting of non-designated heritage assets.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 1 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2048
Site address	Land east of The Street, Thurton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	A number of planning permissions relating to use of the site for camping units and events.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.65 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	At 25dph the site would accommodate 16 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	Part in Flood Zone 3 – would need to be demonstrated not in Flood Zone 3b
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>Constrained as difficulty in creating access with access directly off A146 not acceptable</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access not acceptable from A146. Would increase slowing, stopping and turning movements onto a Principal Route.</p>	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Primary School <input type="checkbox"/> Secondary school <input type="checkbox"/> Local healthcare services <input type="checkbox"/> Retail services <input type="checkbox"/> Local employment opportunities <input type="checkbox"/> Peak-time public transport	Amber	<p>Distance to Thurton school 100 metres but need to cross A146</p> <p>Peak time bus service passes site with bus stops in close proximity</p> <p>Employment area on opposite side of The Street</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to village hall and recreation space 250 metres away Adjacent to George and Dragon public house	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Gas pipe located to south west of site. Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are available. AW advise sewers cross the site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues Minerals & Waste – the site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site progresses as an allocation then future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, if the site area was amended to over 1ha, it should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Southern portion of site is located within flood zone 3, plus further area of site with identified flood risk LLFA score (GNLP) – Red recommend a review of the site and potential removal from the plan.	Red
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland B5 Chet Tributary Farmland Agricultural land classification Relatively contained within the wider landscape although highly visible from A146.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would be relatively centrally located in the settlement and could be developed in a way that enhances the townscape	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impact could be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Site is within 400 metres of a Grade I listed building and potentially affects the setting of non-designated heritage assets HES Score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential constraints of close proximity to junction with A146 NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access not acceptable from A146. Would increase slowing, stopping and turning movements onto a Principal Route.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Adjacent to public house as well as agricultural land	Amber

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would be relatively well related to existing development and should be able to be accommodated without having an adverse impact on heritage assets	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Unlikely to be achievable. Access onto A146 would not be acceptable whilst it is unlikely that an adoptable access road can be achieved onto The Street	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Field used for camping and events, no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Public house to south which could cause some capability issues however these should be able to be mitigated through the design of the scheme. Agricultural to west.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Rising from The Street towards the west	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Recently planted hedge along A146 boundary	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerows could provide some habitat as could nearby watercourse	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No known contamination issues	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views from A146 into 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)	Site not suitable to be allocated due to access constraints	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	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?	Single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately		
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

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

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

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p><i>Suitability</i></p> <p>The site is of a suitable size for allocation. Highways concerns have been identified including the creation of a safe access into the site. Development of the site is also considered likely to have an impact on both designated and non-designated heritage assets. Significant flood risk concerns have also been identified.</p> <p><i>Site Visit Observations</i></p> <p>Site sites relatively well within the existing structure of the settlement. However, as access is not possible from the A146 it is severely constrained due to the very narrow site frontage on to The Street</p> <p><i>Local Plan Designations</i></p> <p>Outside but adjacent to the development boundary.</p> <p><i>Availability</i></p> <p>Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p><i>Achievability</i></p> <p>Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be an unreasonable option for allocation. The site is relatively well contained within the existing structure of the settlement. However, as access is not possible from the A146 it is severely constrained due to the very narrow site frontage on to The Street.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 1 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4008
Site address	Land to the south-east of The Street, Thurton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No recent planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph - – 12 to 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	Green	<p>Access to the site possible from The Street</p> <p>Highways score – Amber. Access requires removal of frontage hedge/trees & c/w widening to 5.5m. No safe walking route to school, requires provision of f/w & formal signalised crossing facilities. Increase slowing/stopping turning movements at primary road.</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>Distance to Thurton school 250 metres (involves needing to cross A146)</p> <p>Distance to peak time bus service 200 metres (to bus stop for Norwich)</p> <p>In close proximity to employment site</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to village hall and recreation space 400 metres (involves needing to cross A146) Distance to George and Dragon public house 60 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waster water capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has stated that electricity, mains water and sewerage is all available. AW advise sewers cross this site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination issues Minerals & Waste comment – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site becomes an allocation 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	Surface water flood risk along parts of highway boundary with The Street and on sections of The Street itself – would need to be considered if the site progresses further LLFA score – Green (standard planning information required)	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	

		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland Agricultural land classification not clear	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Potential significant impact due to open rising land from The Street towards the church	Amber
Townscape	Green	Potential to match linear development on northern side of The Street but estate development would not relate well to surrounding pattern of development Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. Most development has been to the east side of Norwich Road.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity. NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ Potential for protected species, habitats and biodiversity net gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade I listed church to south Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Red. Church to the south – the setting of the church to the north is already built up on north side of The Street but there is a lot of landscaping to the south of the lane which also obscures views. If this is retained and the development would need more landscaping – avoid fencing etc for it not to be considered to have a harmful impact on the wider rural setting of the church. It would also leave quite an oddly shaped field around the church. Thurton in general is more built up on the east side of the Norwich Road. HES Score – Amber	Red

Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Rural road with no footway so may need some improvement Highways score – Red. Access requires removal of frontage hedge/trees & c/w widening to 5.5m. No safe walking route to school, requires provision of f/w & formal signalised crossing facilities. Increase slowing/stopping turning movements at primary road.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Significant impact on setting of Grade I listed church as would block views from The Street, including from non-designated heritage assets.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable but would require removal of hedging. Potential footway requirements could also lead to loss of trees	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north, agricultural in between site and church to south which are all compatible uses. Employment site to north-east, however this is close to other residential properties and development could be designed to have an acceptable relationship with this	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Rising from north to south. Level difference from The Street to south which would add to prominence of any development	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees along boundary of The Street. Southern boundary not currently defined as part of same field	

Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No known contamination issues	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views from road into site, also from church down into the site and from Hall Road and Church Loke	
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)	Not likely to be suitable due to impact on setting of church, though confirmation should be sought from Senior Heritage and Design Officer	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	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?	Single private ownership	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	Yes Green
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	Green

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

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated. Significant heritage concerns have been raised – the site is in close proximity to a Grade I listed Church. Highways issues have also been identified, including the creation of a safe access and the likely removal of frontage vegetation to allow for access into the site.

Site Visit Observations

Field forms important part of setting of grade I listed church on the hill. Development of the site would have significant impact on this.

Local Plan Designations

The site is outside but adjacent to the existing development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be unreasonable for allocation. The site forms an important part of setting of the Grade I listed church on the hill. Development on this site would have significant impact on the setting of the listed building.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 7 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4038
Site address	Land south of Mill Road, Ashby St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No recent planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	4 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocation site for mixed use including tech business starter units and 40 zero carbon accessible homes, footpath enhancement scheme and extension to settlement boundary
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unclear as proportion of site to be used for employment use not specified
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 options on Mill Road constrained</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red Increase in slowing /stopping turning movements not acceptable at corridor for movement. No walking route via Mill Road. Mill Road not suitable for access. Footway at A146 narrow, would require widening to 2.0m min</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>Distance to Thurton school 570 metres</p> <p>Distance to peak time bus service 700 metres</p> <p>Distance to employment site 750 metres</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to village hall and recreation space 600 metres Distance to George and Dragon public house 750 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage, gas and electricity are all available. AW advise sewers crossing this site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues Minerals & Waste comment – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site becomes an allocation 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	Amber	Area of identified surface water flood risk in southern part of site which could constrain development in that part of the site but would not prevent allocation of the wider site for development. In addition, small areas at northern end by highway boundary but these should be able to mitigated LLFA score – Green (standard planning information required)	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Rural River Valley	

SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Tributary Farmland	X	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland		
		Settled Plateau Farmland		
		Plateau Farmland		
		Valley Urban Fringe		
		Fringe Farmland		
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland Agricultural land classification unclear		
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Large field on raised ground.		Amber
Townscape	Amber	Although site is adjacent to estate development constraints on access result in a poor relationship		Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC Ecology score – SSSI IRZ Potential for protected species, habitats and biodiversity net gain.		Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets in vicinity HES Score – Amber		Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space		Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Mill Road past site has a number of constraints Highways score – Amber. Increase in slowing /stopping turning movements not acceptable at corridor for movement. No walking route via Mill Road. Mill Road not suitable for access. Footway at A146 narrow, would require widening to 2.0m min		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?	Site is a large field that whilst contiguous with existing estate development has no relationship with it in terms of their design and connectivity. It would therefore be an entirely separate development accessed from Mill Road which would therefore have a poor relationship with existing development in the village.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Mill Road descends as it passes to the site before sharply turning to the north. There are a number of trees preventing access immediately adjacent to existing development resulting in the only feasible position for an access being towards the bend and away from the existing development which emphasises the poor relationship of the site with the existing development in the village	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural use with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to east with agricultural land to the west. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Rises from northern end of site then level out	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge on boundary with gardens of properties to east. Hedging and trees on boundary with field to west. Trees on boundary with Mill Road at north-eastern corner. Trees on residential boundary to south.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries. Watercourse to north of site.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No known contamination issues	

Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Public right of way crosses site. Views into site from Mill Road limited due to relief of land.	
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)	Given the poor relationship with existing development in the settlement to the east and potential access constraints it is not considered that this site is 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	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?	Single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	The site is owned by a promoter/ developer		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		Green

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

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability Site is too large to be allocated for 25 dwellings, but could be reduced in size to be a suitable size for allocation. However, the site has a poor relationship with existing development and highways constraints have also been identified.

Site Visit Observations Development of the site would have poor relationship with existing development to the east due to the lack of connectivity. Potential access constraints from Mill Road.

Local Plan Designations The site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability Promoter states the site is available.

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be an unreasonable option for allocation. Development of the site would have poor relationship with existing development to the east due to the lack of connectivity. There are potential access constraints from Mill Road.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4039
Site address	Land south of Mill Road, Ashby St Mary (reduced site)
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No recent planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Promoted as extension to settlement boundary for five zero carbon accessible homes and footpath enhancement scheme <i>but due to the size of the site it has been considered as both an allocation site and an extension to the settlement limit</i>
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	5dph
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 options on Mill Road constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. No walking route via Mill Road. Mill Road not suitable for access.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Distance to Thurton school 570 metres Distance to peak time bus service 700 metres Distance to employment site 750 metres	
<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 		Distance to village hall and recreation space 600 metres Distance to George and Dragon public house 750 metres	Green

Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage, gas and electricity are all available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues Minerals & Waste comment – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site becomes an allocation 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	Amber	Small areas of surface water flood risk near highway boundary but should be able to mitigate LLFA score – Green (standard planning information required)	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland Agricultural land classification unclear	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Large field on raised ground.	Amber

Townscape	Amber	Although site is adjacent to estate development constraints on access result in a poor relationship	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC Ecology score – SSSI IRZ Potential for protected species, habitats and biodiversity net gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets in vicinity HES Score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Mill Road past site has a number of constraints NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. No walking route via Mill Road. Mill Road not suitable for access.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is part of a large field that whilst adjacent with existing development to east has no relationship with it in terms of their design and connectivity. It would therefore be an entirely separate development accessed from Mill Road which would therefore have a poor relationship with existing development in the village.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Mill Road descends as it passes to the site before sharply turning to the north. There are a number of trees preventing access immediately adjacent to existing development resulting in the only feasible position for an access being towards the bend and away from the existing development which emphasises the poor relationship of the site with the existing development in the village	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural use with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to east with agricultural land to the west and in remainder of field to south. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Rises from northern end of site then level out	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge on boundary with gardens of properties to east. Hedging and trees on boundary with field to west. Trees on boundary with Mill Road at north-eastern corner.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries. Watercourse to north of site.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No known contamination issues	

Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Public right of way crosses site. Views into site from Mill Road limited due to relief of land.	
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)	Given the poor relationship with existing development in the settlement to the east and potential access constraints it is not considered that this site is 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	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?	Single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	The site is owned by a developer/ promoter		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Potential footway provision along Mill Road	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that they are aware of affordable housing requirements but no viability evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Yes, footpath enhancement	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability Promoted as an extension to the settlement limit to accommodate five dwellings, but the site is of sufficient size for allocate for up to 25 dwellings. Access constraints to the site have been identified.

Site Visit Observations Development of the site would have poor relationship with existing development to the east due to the lack of connectivity. Potential access constraints from Mill Road

Local Plan Designations Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

Availability Promoter states the site is available.

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be unreasonable. The site is promoted at a density that would result in an inefficient use of land. Development of a larger site would have poor relationship with existing development to the east due to the lack of connectivity. There are also potential access constraints from Mill Road.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4040
Site address	Land south of Mill Common, Ashby St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No recent planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.98 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocation for residential with public open space, new footpaths and extension to settlement boundary
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approximately 50 dwellings at 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	Mill Common is a constrained rural lane Highways score – Green. Would require removal of frontage edge/tree. Mill Common too narrow to support dev traffic, no footway. Concern re visibility to Ashby Road at junction with Mill Common.	Green
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	Distance to Thurton school 470 metres Distance to peak time bus service 600 metres Distance to employment site 670 metres	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to village hall and recreation space 500 metres Distance to George and Dragon public house 670 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage, gas and electricity are all available. AW advise sewers cross this site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues Minerals & Waste comment – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site becomes an allocation 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	Amber	Surface water flood risk along northern boundary of site and along Low Common LLFA score – Amber (significant planning information required. Heavy mitigation would be required)	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland Agricultural land classification unclear	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Rolling rural landscape. Although relatively contained with hedging, potential for any development to have an adverse impact.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Adjacent to existing settlement but doesn't relate well to any existing estate development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity. NCC Ecology score – SSSI IRZ Potential for protected species, habitats and biodiversity net gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	No designated heritage assets in vicinity, however some non-designated heritage assets potentially affected HES Score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Mill Common is a constrained rural lane NCC Highways – Red. Would require removal of frontage edge/tree. Mill Common too narrow to support dev traffic, no footway. Concern re visibility to Ashby Road at junction with Mill Common.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Although adjacent to the settlement when viewed on plan, Low Common feels separate from the main part of the settlement and therefore development of this site would not relate well to the existing settlement. In addition, it would be harmful to the setting of non-designated heritage assets.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would result in loss of hedgerow along Mill Common. Mill Common is also a narrow lane with no footways which is unlikely to be acceptable development of 12 or more dwellings.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural so no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to east and west, with agricultural to north and on opposite side of Mill Common to south. No compatibility issues.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Land falls from west to east	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow along highway boundary. Trees on north-eastern boundary	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees and hedging contain habitat, watercourse along north of site	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No likely contamination issues	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views of site are limited due to boundary treatment	

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)	Not suitable for allocation due to likely access issues and impact on character of area	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	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?	Single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	The site is owned by a developer/ promoter		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		Green

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

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Site should be reduced slightly to be more suitable for an allocation of 25 dwellings. Highways concerns have been identified as well as potential impact of development on non-designated heritage assets and the landscape.

Site Visit Observations

Site has attractive rural character which development would adversely affect. Access would also be of constrained rural lane requiring removal of hedgerow.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be unreasonable. This is primarily on the basis of adverse impacts on the local landscape including a requirement to remove existing vegetation and trees in order to create a suitable access and adequate visibility at the Mill Common/ Mill Road/ Ashby Road junction.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 8 July 2020