

Toft Monks, Aldeby, Haddiscoe,
Wheatacre & Burgh St Peter
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

Contents

SN0014SL	3
SN0392	10
SN0414	17
SN0518	27
SN1031	34
SN2005SL	42
SN4003	50
SN4010	56
SN4015	63
SN4016	70
SN4017	77

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0014SL
Site address	Land to the east of Rushley, Station Road, Aldeby
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Historic refusal for two dwellings
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.13 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – one or two dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
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 are constrained due to nature of road NCC HIGHWAYS – RED Substandard highway network and no safe walking route to school.	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 	Red	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School 3.6km Bus service passes site with bus stops in close proximity Local employment at Aldeby Business Park 2.2km	
<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 Burgh St Peter village hall 2.5km Distance to White Lion public house 1.8km	Red

Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Confirmation that that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available required	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	Green	No identified flood risk	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	X
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland ALC: Grade 2	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained within landscape. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of site would reflect linear pattern of development in vicinity	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY – Amber SSSI IRZ. Land is Priority Habitat - Deciduous woodland. Loss of wodland would lead to fragmentation	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES - Amber	Green

Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained consisting of rural lanes with no footways	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would be infill development in between existing dwellings in linear pattern	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would require loss of trees and hedging on site frontage	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to east and west, agricultural land to south and on opposite side of road. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees on highway boundary and on boundary with field to south	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries and also in planting within the site	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are very limited due to trees and hedging	

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 due to remote location and visual impact from loss of trees on site	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?	Site is in private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)			
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately		
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

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

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Site potentially suitable size for a settlement limit extension, although there is no current settlement limit in this location. Highways and access constraints have been identified. The site is also located within ALC Grade 2, which is very good quality agricultural land.

Site Visit Observations

Site is a gap in a linear pattern of development along the southern side of Station Road. There are currently a number of trees and hedging along the site frontage which would need to be removed if development were to be progressed.

Local Plan Designations

Outside and removed from any development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is an unreasonable option for inclusion in settlement limit. Whilst the site is situated in between a smaller group of dwellings along Station Road, it is separated from the main village and the surrounding local facilities, an issue exacerbated by the lack of local footways. The site is also heavily constrained by dense tree cover and hedging to all boundaries which would require removing to enable development of the site; this would have a negative landscape impact. Whilst the site doesn't currently appear to be in agricultural rotation, the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) for the site is Grade 2, which is very good quality agricultural land with minor limitations.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 5 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0392
Site address	Land at the junction of the A146 and B1136, Haddiscoe
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.8 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation – approximately 25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified 20dph
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 due to hedgerows on highway boundaries and proximity to junction of A143 and B1136</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber Unlikely to achieve required visibility without removal of large proportion of frontage hedge. Would require 2m f/w at A143/B1136 junction and at full extent of A143 frontage. 1.2km walk along A143, including crossing the road to access school unlikely to be attractive to parents and may result in additional car journeys to school, causing additional concerns re manoeuvring vehicles at the A143.</p>	Amber

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School 1.3km with footway, although would need to cross A143 Bus route passes site	
		Distance to Haddiscoe village hall and recreation ground 300 metres Distance to The Haddiscoe Tavern public house 600 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewer capacity and local waste water treatment capacity are constraints	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter is unsure if mains water, sewerage and electricity are 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	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	X
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland ALC: Grade 2/3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Would be detrimental to position of church as landmark within local landscape.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of site would not relate well to existing pattern of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Proximity to a SSSI	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	In close proximity to Grade I listed St Marys Church and associated grade II listed monument and memorial NCC HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Amber	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Constraints on junction of A146 and B1136 NCC HIGHWAYS - Red	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Place of worship, residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Would result in loss of part of open setting of Grade I listed church which cannot be mitigated against	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways have advised that creation of an access is likely to require removal of large part of hedge	
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 properties on opposite side of A143, church to west and agricultural land on opposite side of B1136 to north. No compatibility issues	

What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level but elevated from adjacent roads	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows along both road boundaries. Individual trees along western and southern boundaries	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site prominent in views along A143 and B1136	
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 acceptable given impact on setting of church and its position in the local landscape. Development of the site would also have poor relationship with other existing development and access would lead to loss of hedgerow	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?	Site is in single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
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	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated. Highways, heritage and landscape have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Agricultural land that forms an important part of the setting of the church. If the site were to be developed, then the church's position in the local landscape would be compromised. Hedgerow along highway boundaries which contribute to character of area and would be lost if site were to be developed.

Local Plan Designations

Site is adjacent to but outside of the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is an unreasonable option for allocation. The site is located immediately adjacent to the Grade I Listed St Marys Church which has associated Grade II monument and memorial. Development of the site in this location would cause harm to the setting of the church and its position in a relatively open landscape. Development of the site would have a poor relationship with the existing pattern of development in evidence. It is unlikely that the required access visibility splays can be achieved without removal of large sections of the frontage hedgerow.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 4 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0414
Site address	Land north and south of Beccles Road, Haddiscoe
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Applications relating to caravan site use on site 1, historic refusals for one or two dwellings on site 2, no relevant history on site 3.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Site 1 (north of A143 / B1136 junction): 0.5 hectares; site 2 (north of Beccles Road and east of The Loke): 1.54 hectares, and site 3 (south of Beccles Road): 4.9 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocations – site 1 for 5 units, site 2 for 39 units and site 3 for potentially 122 units
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Largely greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

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

Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access is a significant constraint to sites east and west of The Loke</p> <p>NCC Highways - Red <u>North Eastern Section:</u> A143 frontage would require visibility splays at access in accordance with DMRB, unlikely to be achievable with the available 90m despite there being a 2m footway. The Loke measures at 3.4m on NMB, it wouldn't be feasible for 2 vehicles to pass which would be a particular concern regarding egress from A143, width seems fairly typical over the length of the road. Widening north of the A143 junction doesn't appear feasible. Safe pedestrian access could be formed at A143. <u>North Western Section:</u> too close to A143/B1336 junction to enable safe access. <u>Southern Section:</u> Stopping & turning movements at A143 with potential issues re visibility – would require most if not all trees to be removed from site frontage and provision of right turn facility. 1.2km walk along A143 to access school unlikely to be attractive to parents and may result in additional car journeys to school, causing additional concerns re manoeuvring vehicles at the A143.</p> <p>NCC Highways (meeting update Jan 2021) 3 parcels of land. All fronting the A143, which is a Corridor of Movement, with the associated restrictions. Vehicular access issue to both north and south which require a new junction; would new junctions be acceptable on CoM/what arrangements would be needed for right hand turns? The Loke, adjacent the NE site, is very restricted. There is a continuous footpath to the school, but this requires crossing the A143 close to</p>	Amber
--------------------	-------	---	-------

		the busy A143/B1136 junction. Land to south would be preferable as this would allow for a new footway on this side of the A143 and potentially a crossing point in a better location. Development could help reinforce the 30mph speed limit.	
Accessibility to local services and facilities	Amber	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School 1.3km Bus service runs past site	
<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		Site 3 is adjacent to village hall with sites 1 and 2 also in relatively close proximity Distance to The Haddiscoe Tavern public house 350 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewer capacity and local waster water treatment capacity are constraints	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but not sewerage 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	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified surface water risk on highway	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	X
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland ALC: Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development of parts of site could be detrimental to position of church as landmark within local landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Sites 1 and 2 are relatively well contained within settlement SNC Landscape Officer – concerns with impacts on the views of the Church on approach; consider that it conflicts with the landscape character assessment and what it is seeking to preserve – an indicative plan would need to demonstrate how an impact on the views could be mitigated; land rises to the south so would appear prominent; sites to sites to the north have tree issues.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Proximity to SSSI	Amber

Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Potential impact on Grade I listed St Marys Church and associated grade II listed monument and memorial</p> <p>NCC HES – Amber</p> <p>SNC Heritage officer- – on plan the site does not look well related to the setting of the church – however, in reality when driving along the A143 west, the field is very open in views and the church is a very prominent landmark feature when seen in this rural setting. This is also quite an old route to Yarmouth with the crossing at Haddiscoe – so quite an historic view. The church will still be viewed from closer to – but I would say any development here would have a degree of harm on the setting. Potential mitigation could be setting the buildings further back from road etc.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Parts of local road network are heavily constrained, particularly The Loke	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Village hall to east, residential and agricultural	Amber

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Sites 1 and 2 are more contained visually, with site 2 relating better to the existing settlement. Site 3 would not relate well to existing pattern of development and would adversely affect landscape character and also has more potential to adversely affect the setting of the church	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access unlikely to be acceptable off A143, whilst The Loke is highly constrained. Further clarification from the Highway Authority required	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Either agricultural, garden or use as a caravan site. No compatibility issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Village hall could result in some compatibility issues with site 3, but given distance from boundary and relation with other residential properties is unlikely to prevent residential development.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site 1 is flat, site 2 levels fall to the north, site 3 levels fall towards the southern boundary	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site 1 is enclosed by mature trees and hedgerows. Site 2 has trees along southern, eastern and northern boundaries. Boundaries of site 3 are more open but still with sections of hedgerows and trees.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries of site. Some trees within site 1.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing contamination or infrastructure	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site 3 from A143, views of sites 1 and 2 more constrained by vegetation	

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 3 would not relate to existing pattern of development and would potentially impact on setting of church. Site 1 is also more detached from the existing pattern of development, but site 2 could be acceptable in form and character terms if an acceptable access can be found	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?	Site is in single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
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	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified other than visual improvement of site	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Sites can be modified to be an acceptable size for an allocation.

Site Visit Observations

Sites 1 and 2 are more contained visually, with site 2 relating better to the existing settlement. Site 3 would not relate well to existing pattern of development and would adversely affect landscape character and also has more potential to adversely affect the setting of the church

Local Plan Designations

Sites are outside the development boundary, although either adjacent to or in close proximity.

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 much larger than the scale of development currently being sought, however a smaller parcel could be a reasonable allocation for development, subject to achieving a suitable access and mitigation for landscape and heritage harm. All three sites front the A143, a Corridor of Movement. Whilst the north eastern site has The Lock running to the west this is a narrow and constrained access which is not considered to be an acceptable access point. An existing footpath runs to the northern side of the A143 whilst development of the southern parcel could allow for a new footway on this side of the road and a better located crossing point for the school. Development could have an impact on the setting of the Grade I listed Church and it is noted that on approach from the west the Church is a prominent feature in this rural landscape setting. Given the site size however, potential mitigation measures could be incorporated into the layout and design of the site include setting the buildings further back within the site. An indicative plan would need to demonstrate how the impact of development on these views could be appropriately mitigated.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 7 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0518
Site address	Land at the post office and Beccles Road, Toft Monks
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	5 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocation – numbers not specified
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
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>Possibility of creating suitable access is significantly constrained as Post Office Road is a narrow rural lane and access onto A143.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</p> <p>Access onto A143 would not be supported. Access onto Post Office Road would require road widening to 5.5m, 2m site frontage footway and removal of existing hedge. Would increase slowing, stopping and turning movements at Post Office Road / A143 junction where visibility is restricted. Local road network is considered to be unsuitable. No continuous footway to catchment school.</p>	Amber

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	Amber	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School 1.4km with footway along A143 but intimidating route given nature of road Distance to bus service 100 metres	
			No village or community hall within 1.8km Distance to White Lion public house 70 metres
Utilities Capacity	Amber		Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	HELAA – small areas within and around the perimeter of the site are at moderate risk of surface water flooding	
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	X
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would result in erosion of rural character to east of settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would relate to existing settlement to west	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Within SSSI impact zone	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space NCC HES - Amber	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained with Post Office Road comprising of a narrow lane with no pedestrian facilities. NCC HIGHWAYS – Red	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development to east of existing settlement could have acceptable relationship in townscape terms, but would erode rural character of Post Office Road	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways note that access could only be from Post Office Road and this would require road widening to 5.5 metres, two metre site front frontage footway and removal of existing hedge.	
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 properties to west, agricultural land to north, east (beyond belt to trees) and south. No compatibility issues.	

What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site largely level but falling towards southern boundary	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Belt of trees on eastern boundary, hedgerow along northern boundary with Post Office Road, trees and hedging along boundary with A143. Southern boundary is relatively open	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site from Post Office Road and A143 at field accesses.	
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 acceptable due to access issues and intrusion into open landscape along Post Office Road	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?	Site is in single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
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>	Road widening and footway provision would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Larger site could provide local community village hall, open space and provision of local employment use	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is too large for an allocation of 12 to 25 dwellings but could be reduced to a more appropriate size. Highway and landscape constraints identified.

Site Visit Observations

Large field along eastern side of village. Bounds A143 to south-west and narrow Post Office Lane to the north, which has a rural character through open countryside which development of this site would harm.

Local Plan Designations

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 an unreasonable option for development. The wider site is significantly too large in the context of this Plan document and no smaller parcels of the site are considered to be suitable for development due to the issues relating to access into the site. Access directly onto the A143 is considered to be unacceptable in highways terms and access onto Post Office Road to the north would require substantial road upgrades and the significant removal of an existing hedgerow. Highway safety concerns include increased slowing, stopping and turning movements at Post Office Road/ A143 junction where visibility is restricted. Although parts of the site are within close proximity to some local services and facilities, actual accessibility to these is much more limited due to the constraints of the local highway network.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 7 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN1031
Site address	Land to the south / east of Bulls Green Lane, Toft Monks
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.8 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation – 8 dwellings, could be extended to 12 or more dwellings for allocation under the village cluster criteria
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
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>Possibility of creating an access is constrained due to planting on boundary and nature of road</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber Access would require road widening to 5.5m, 2m site frontage footway and removal of hedging. Local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted width and lack of footway provision. No continuous footway to catchment school. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.</p> <p>NCC Highways (meeting Jan 2021)- Bulls Green Lane is narrow, single carriageway, no footways, with limited visibility. Substandard highway network generally, including the junction with the A143. Would not be acceptable as an allocation.</p>	Amber

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School 1.8km Distance to bus service 400 metres	
		No village or community hall within 1.8km Distance to White Lion public house 400 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Enhancements to waste water capacity may be required to serve growth in this location	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, and electricity are available but unsure about sewerage 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	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Small areas of site are at risk of surface water flooding but these are outside the area indicatively shown to be developed	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	X
		Settled Plateau Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Site is relatively contained within landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land</p> <p>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER New planting to the south-east and south-west; concerns about the eastern boundary and this would require further arboricultural investigations</p>	Green
Townscape	Amber	Site adjoins existing development and would not be out of character	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No heritage assets in close proximity</p> <p>NCC HES – Amber</p> <p>SNC HERITAGE OFFICER- No objection in principle, subject to design/layout to avoid crammed on plot parking.</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local road network is highly constrained consisting of narrow lane with no footway</p> <p>NCC HUGHWAYS – Red The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would be relatively well contained within the existing pattern of development. No harm to the historic environment	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways note that access would require road widening to 5.5 metres, two metre site frontage footway and removal of hedgerow.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north and on opposite side of Bulls Green Lane to west. Agricultural land to south and south-east with belt of trees in between. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees on highway boundary. Belt of trees with agricultural land to south and south-east. Belt of protected trees on boundary with residential properties to north.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on site boundaries. Some potential for habitat within site given trees and bushes	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site are very limited due to vegetation on boundaries	

<p>Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>Development of this site is dependent on an arboricultural assessment of the trees and vegetation on the highway boundary and within the site that would need to be removed to allow development. If they are not considered to be of significant value if replacement planting can be achieved, and subject to delivery of the required highway improvements, then development of this site could be acceptable in terms of form and character</p>	<p>Amber</p>
---	--	--------------

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is much larger than the scale of development currently being sought, however a small part of the site could be allocated for 12 to 25 dwellings. Development of the site would be subject to achieving a satisfactory access; highway constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site is a visually well contained site due to tree belts on all boundaries. There is also vegetation within the site. In terms of the pattern of development in the settlement, development of the site could relate well and would not be intrusive into the open countryside beyond the existing extent of development.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be unreasonable due to identified highway and access constraints. Access to the site would require road widening of Bull Green Lane and the removal of hedgerows. Bulls Green Lane is of narrow, single carriageway width with no footways and limited visibility and it has been concluded that there is no realistic possibility of creating an appropriate access into the site. Additionally, the surrounding highways network is considered to be substandard, including the junction with the A143. Landscape constraints have also been identified; whilst there is relatively new planting to the south-east and south-west, along the eastern boundary is a protected tree belt which would require further arboricultural investigation.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 7 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2005SL
Site address	Land off Bulls Green Lane, Toft Monks
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.24 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	SL
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
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>Possibility of creating an access is constrained due to planting on boundary and nature of road</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red Access visibility is likely to be restricted by adjacent land. Local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted width and lack of footway provision. No continuous footway to catchment school. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes</p>	Amber

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School 1.8km Distance to bus service 400 metres	
		No village or community hall within 1.8km Distance to White Lion public house 400 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Enhancements to waste water capacity may be required to serve growth in this location	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, and electricity are available but unsure about sewerage 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	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Small areas of site are at risk of surface water flooding but these are outside the area indicatively shown to be developed	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	X
		Settled Plateau Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Plateau Farmland		
		Valley Urban Fringe		
		Fringe Farmland		
		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland		
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained within landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land		Green
Townscape	Amber	Site adjoins existing development and would not be out of character		Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY – Green Adjacent to SN1031. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity net Gain		Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES – Amber SNC HERITAGE OFFICER- No objection in principle		Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space		Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is highly constrained consisting of narrow lane with no footway NCC HUGHWAYS – Red Local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted width and lack of footway provision. No continuous footway to catchment school. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.		Amber

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

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would be relatively well contained within the existing pattern of development. No harm to the historic environment	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways note that access would require road widening to 5.5 metres, two metre site frontage footway and removal of hedgerow.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north and on opposite side of Bulls Green Lane to west. Agricultural land to south and south-east with belt of trees in between. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees on highway boundary. Belt of trees with agricultural land to south and south-east. Belt of protected trees on boundary with residential properties to north.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on site boundaries. Some potential for habitat within site given trees and bushes	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site are very limited due to vegetation on boundaries	

<p>Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>Development of this site is dependent on an arboricultural assessment of the trees and vegetation on the highway boundary and within the site that would need to be removed to allow development. If they are not considered to be of significant value if replacement planting can be achieved, and subject to delivery of the required highway improvements, then development of this site could be acceptable in terms of form and character</p>	<p>Amber</p>
---	--	--------------

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for a SL Extension. Development of the site would be subject to achieving a satisfactory access; highway constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site is a visually well contained site due to tree belts on all boundaries. There is also vegetation within the site. In terms of the pattern of development in the settlement, development of the site could relate well and would not be intrusive into the open countryside beyond the existing extent of development.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is unreasonable option for a Settlement Limit extension due to identified highway and access constraints. Access would require road widening of Bull Green Lane and removal of hedgerows. Bulls Green Lane is narrow, single carriageway width with no footways and with limited visibility. It has been concluded that there is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. In addition to this, the surrounding highway network is substandard.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 7 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4003
Site address	Land to the east of Common Road, Aldeby
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.68 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocation – minimum 12 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
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 are constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red Substandard highway network, unable to provide safe access. Narrow carriageway, no footway, no safe walking route to school.	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 	Red	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School over 5km Distance to bus service 600 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 Burgh St Peter village hall and recreation ground 1.2km Distance to White Lion public house 700 metres	Red

Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified surface water flood risk on highway and along northern boundary	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	X
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained within landscape. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Site is relatively well contained within pattern of settlement	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY – Green SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and BNG	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained consisting of narrow lanes with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Red	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 relatively well contained within existing pattern of settlement, but estate development would still be out of character with the surrounding development	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access is from Common Road which is narrow with no footway	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north, south and west. Agricultural land along eastern boundary. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and hedging along highway boundary. Some trees and hedging on other boundaries	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging along boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views across site from access onto highway	
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 distance from services, particularly schools, and the narrow rural road network	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?	Site is in private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
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)	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability Site is of a suitable size to be allocated, subject to achieving a satisfactory access. Highways and surface flood risk has been identified.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Site is located down narrow lanes in a location far from many services, including the nearest primary school. Relatively well contained visually, albeit not in a location that estate development would be in character.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Outside but adjacent to the development boundary.</p> <p>Availability Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p>Achievability No further constraints identified</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is an unreasonable option for allocation. Whilst parts of the site are in close proximity to some local services and facilities, actual accessibility is much more limited due to the constraints of the local highway network. Areas of the site are also affected by surface water flood risk, including on the highway and to the northern boundary. Development would not respect the linear pattern of existing development.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 5 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4010
Site address	Land to the south of Beccles Road, Burgh St Peter
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Developable area of site is outside the development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history for main part of site but permission for four dwellings where access is located (2019/1109)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocation – 12 to 25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
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 are constrained due to limited highway frontage NCC HIGHWAYS – Red No acceptable access, no feasible safe walking route to school.	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 	Red	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School over 5km Bus service runs past site	
<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 Burgh St Peter village hall 500 metres Distance to White Lion public house 250 metres	Red

Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	X
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained within landscape. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of site would constitute backland development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Former school to north could be considered a non-designated heritage asset NCC HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained due to rural roads with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Red	Red

Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Commercial use to west	Amber
------------------------	-------	------------------------	-------

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would be to the rear of a linear pattern of development, therefore out of character with the townscape	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access route passes through land that has the benefit of planning permission for four dwellings. Whilst one of these dwellings has almost been completed the other three are yet to commence and therefore access remains possible at this stage. If the other three are to be developed shortly then they would prohibit access to the site	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential uses to north and east. Commercial site to west consisting of a coach depot which may raise some amenity issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees on western boundary, southern boundary appears relatively open	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees on boundary	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Public views into site are limited as it is largely to the rear of existing development. This will be even more the case when the dwellings along the Beccles Road frontage are constructed.	

Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of site would constitute backland development out of character with linear pattern of development, as well as being remote from services in particular the nearest primary school	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?	Site is in private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
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	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated.

Site Visit Observations

Backland site behind linear pattern of development, including recently permitted development. Site is remote from most services, including the nearest primary school.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is an unreasonable option for allocation. Development of this site would result in backland development, out of character with the existing linear settlement pattern and requiring a convoluted access arrangement which could result in amenity issues for existing residents. Highways concerns about the suitability of the local road network and the lack of footpath provision have also been raised.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 5 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4015
Site address	Land west of Mill Road, Burgh St Peter
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.92 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocation – minimum 12 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
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 are constrained by nature of road NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber Access would require removal of trees at frontage.	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 	Red	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School over 5km Distance to bus service 250 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 Burgh St Peter village hall 500 metres Distance to White Lion public house 600 metres	Red

Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified surface water flood risk on highway and southern boundary	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	X
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would result in erosion of rural character to south of settlement. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Creation of estate development would be out of character	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY – Green SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net gain	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Possible non-designated heritage asset on opposite side of road to east NCC HES - Amber	Amber

Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained as narrow lanes with no footways	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential NCC HIGHWAYS – Red Network - narrow roads. No feasible safe walking route to school.	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Allocation of site is likely to require a small estate development that would be out of character with linear character of development to north.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Vehicular access should be achievable from Mill Road. Pedestrian access is poor.	
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 properties to north and south-east. Otherwise agricultural land. No compatibility issues.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Largely open boundary onto Mill Roads. Trees and hedging on other boundaries	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Mill Road	

Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of site is likely to adversely affect rural character by intruding development south into the open landscape and introducing estate development. Also remote from many services, including primary school	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?	Site is in private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
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	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size to be considered as part of the settlement limit extension. Highways have raised concerns over the lack of footpath provision and that the site is some distance from the nearest school.

Site Visit Observations

Site is to the south of a linear pattern of development. It is currently open countryside to that contributes to the rural character of the area.

Local Plan Designations

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 located to the south of the existing development boundary and is considered to be a reasonable option for a settlement limit extension. Development would need to be subject to achieving a satisfactory access, which may result in the loss of hedgerows and this would need to be addressed prior to development. Development on this site would need to respect the linear pattern of existing development to the north, thereby reducing the overall number of units achievable on the site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 5 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4016
Site address	Land to the east of Mill Road, Burgh St Peter
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.99 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Allocation – minimum 12 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
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 are constrained due to nature of roads NCC HIGHWAYS – Green Network - narrow roads. No feasible safe walking route to school.	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 	Red	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School over 5km Distance to bus service 250 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 Burgh St Peter village hall 500 metres Distance to White Lion public house 600 metres	Red

Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified floor risk on highway and eastern boundary	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	X
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would result in erosion of rural character to south of settlement. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Creation of estate development would be out of character	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY- Green SSSI IRZ. Close to Priority Habitat - Deciduous woodland. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Possible non- designated heritage asset adjacent to site NCC HES - Amber	Amber

Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained as narrow lanes with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS - Red	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?	Allocation of site is likely to require a small estate development that would be out of character with linear character of development to north.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Vehicular access should be achievable from Mill Road. Pedestrian access is poor.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north and south. Agricultural land to east and west on opposite side of Mill Road. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees on most boundaries	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundaries, plus in vegetation within 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 evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Some views into site from Mill Road.	

Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of site is likely to adversely affect rural character by intruding development south into the open landscape and introducing estate development. Also remote from many services, including primary school	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?	Site is in private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
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	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated. Highways and landscape constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site is to the south of a linear pattern of development. It is currently open countryside to that contributes to the rural character of the area.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be an unreasonable option for development. The site is located off Mill Road which is both narrow and restricted. The site is also at the limits of accessibility to services in terms of an acceptable distance, and this is exacerbated by the lack of footways. Development of the site would need to respect the linear pattern of existing development in evidence in order to avoid an urbanising effect in this location. This would restrict development of the site to frontage development only

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 5 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4017
Site address	Land north of Staithe Road, Burgh St Peter
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.64 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	Allocation – minimum 12 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
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 are constrained due to nature of road NCC Highways – Green No feasible safe walking route to school.	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 	Red	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School over 5km Bus stops close by	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Burgh St Peter village hall 150 metres Distance to White Lion public house 400 metres	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface water flood risk in south-west corner	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	X
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained within landscape. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Site is relatively well contained within pattern of settlement	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green

Historic Environment	Green	No heritage sites in close proximity NCC HES – Green SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and biodiversity net gain. Close to a registered common- Dick's Mount and The Parish Pit	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained as narrow lanes with no footways NCC Highways – Red No feasible safe walking route to school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is relatively well contained within existing pattern of settlement, but estate development would still be out of character with the surrounding development	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable but likely to result in loss of hedgerow. Pedestrian access is poor	
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 properties on southern side of Staithe Road and also to east and west of site. Agricultural land to north. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level.	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge along southern boundary with Staithe Road, with some hedging and trees on other boundaries	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on site boundaries	

Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overheard power cable running east to west across site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Some views across site from Staithe Road.	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not likely to be suitable due to distance from services, particularly schools, and the narrow rural road network	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?	Site is in private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
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	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated. Highway and landscape constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site is located far from many services, including the nearest primary school, along rural lanes with no footway. Relatively well contained within the existing pattern of development in the settlement, albeit not in a location that estate development would be in character.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be a reasonable option for development. Access can be achieved via Staithe Road, however there is existing hedgerow that may need to be removed in order to achieve visibility, this would need to be assessed in accordance with hedgerow regulations. Highways concerns have been raised about the lack of footways and safe walking route to the local primary school. The site is relatively well contained within the existing pattern of development within the settlement and although development of the site would represent a breakout into the countryside to the north of Staithe Road, it is considered that townscape and landscape impacts could be mitigated. It is noted that overhead power cables run east to west across the site and there is an area of surface water flood risk adjacent to the south west corner of the site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 5 January 2021