

Woodton & Bedingham
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

Contents

SN0150	3
SN0231REV.....	12
SN0262	21
SN0268SL	32
SN0278	41
SN0452	52
SN1009SL	62
SN2100.....	70
SN2130.....	78

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0150
Site address	Land to the east of Chapel Hill and south of Hempnall Road, Woodton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land - unallocated
Planning History	2019/0208 REFUSED – Outline application for 30x dwellings (Reasons for refusal: outside of the development boundary, impact on the highway network, landscape impact and impact on non-designated heritage assets) 1981/4122 REFUSED – 4x dwellings
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.7 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site – development of up to 20 dwellings with open space, planting and community facilities. Development is promoted to the north of the site only (although the site promoter has indicated a larger site could be made available if required)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	7 dph (submission form promotes a large site but indicates development within just part of this area)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	The site has road frontage access to both Hempnall Road and Chapel Hill NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access onto Chapel Hill would require carriageway widening up to 5.5m, 2m wide footway to link in with existing provision on Hempnall Road and demonstration visibility at Chapel Hill / Hempnall Road junction is acceptable.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Access to local services including: primary school, village shop, bus route Primary school – approximately 665m (along The Street) Public House – approximately 15m Village shop – approximately 40m Bus route – approximately 5m	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		(see above)	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	There are some overhead cables crossing the site but these are to the south of the site and outside the area that has been suggested for development by the site promoter. These lines are not shown on the UK Power Networks map (possibly BT apparatus?)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Better Broadband is already available in this location	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site does not lie within the identified Cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known issues on the site NCC M&W – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site proceeds as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface Water Flooding to the north east of the site, as well as adjacent to the promoted site (to the east and the south)	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	

		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B4: Waveney Tributary Farmland (settlements within agricultural landscape, but these do not dominate the overall landscape)	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Red	Due to the topography of the site and its key location development would be prominent in the landscape (see also 2019/0208) ALC: Grade 4	Red
Townscape	Amber	Development could integrate with the existing settlement form but would be in a prominent location within the landscape	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	A CWS (Fox Burrows) lies in close proximity to the site. A stream runs along the eastern boundary. The recent planning application found that impacts could be mitigated. NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain. Site adjacent to Priority Habitat - Deciduous woodland and near Lowland Heath (priority habitat).	Amber
Historic Environment	Red	Potential impact on Woodton Grange (Grade II), as well as impact on non-designated heritage assets The Kings Head and the Methodist Chapel (as noted in 2019/0208) HES – Amber	Red

Open Space	Green	Open space is included in the potential development of the site and there would be no loss of existing open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	HA to advise about potential impact of an access onto the Hempnall Road as part of their assessment of the site NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Wider local road network (Knaves Lane & Church Road) is considered to be unsuitable due to road width, lack of footway to catchment school and substandard visibility at nearby junctions (Hempnall Road / B1332). Already objected to an application on this site.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	As noted in app 2019/0208, the Kings Head PH lies in close proximity to the site and would be impacted by development to the north of this site. Overall, development in this location within the settlement is linear and an 'estate pattern' of development would not be in keeping with the existing grain – would consider development to have an adverse townscape impact	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would need to be via Hempnall Road – road frontage access possible (subject to Highways comments) – footpath would need to be extended along this frontage. Access along Chapel Hill not preferred due to width of the road	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land	

What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural – PH and village stores opposite the site; no significant impact on the site	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site has significant changes in levels and slopes down to the north. Development would be very prominent on this site particularly when travelling along Hempnall Road	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	No site boundaries along Hempnall Road – bus shelter on the site frontage – hedgerow along Chapel Road which should be retained if possible if this site is allocated	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Not visible on the site visit	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Telegraph poles across the south of the site – possible BT apparatus (see comments above)	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is very prominent within the landscape due to the topography of the land; linear development around the site is less obtrusive due to the rolling nature of the landscape; the site itself is open with minimal landscape features (apart from the topography)	
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 this site would have an adverse impact on the landscape that could not easily be mitigated, as well as on a local non-designated heritage asset opposite the 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)
Flood Zones 2 & 3		
Conclusion	FZs affect part of the site	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No (2019/0208 – concerns were raised about the viability of the scheme proposed and the works required to the junction)	Amber

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes – improvements to the local road network (crossroads at Hempnall Road are likely to be required – see 2019/0208)	Red
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Unspecified community facilities, public open space	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is too large however it could be reduced in scale. Notwithstanding this the site is not considered to be suitable for development as it has a number of constraints that have been tested by the submission of a planning application and that were subsequently considered to be too difficult to overcome/ mitigate.

Site Visit Observations

Due to the topography of the site and the immediate landscape development in this location would be prominent and would have an adverse impact on the townscape, as well as on the Kings Head PH located immediately opposite the site.

Local Plan Designations

There is an area of flood zone on the site which would affect layout of any development on the site, potentially requiring development to be located in a more prominent location on the site (therefore impacting on the local landscape).

Availability

The land is available for development

Achievability

If this site were to be considered as a reasonable site, additional viability evidence would be required to demonstrate viability of the site due to the likely improvements that would be required to the highway network.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be unreasonable due to the adverse impact development in this location would have on the local landscape, as well as the adverse impact that development would have on the local non-designated heritage assets.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 5th August 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0231REV
Site address	Land north of Suckling Place, Woodton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated/ Agricultural land
Planning History	No recent planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocated site – for between 12-25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approximately 25 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>The site currently does not have a clear access point, however an application is pending for the adjoining parcel of land and this would enable access into the site</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. No access to the site. Crossroads junction (The Street/Hempnall Road/Chapel Hill) is poor and the Hempnall Road/B1332 junction is very poor. The Street itself is narrow, with limited footways, restricted forward visibility and a poor junction with the B1332, and the junction accessing the existing allocation is not ideal, therefore not supported in Highways terms.</p>	Red

<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	Green	<p>Access to local services including: village shop, public house, bus stop within approximately 330m</p> <p>Access to primary school – approximately 635m</p>	
		As above	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Availability of utilities on the site to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No constraints identified	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an area identified as being within the ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	<p>There are currently 2x slurry beds to the south of the site. The promoter of the site has advised that these are now redundant and can be removed from the site.</p> <p>NCC M&W – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site proceeds as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Amber

Flood Risk	Amber	<p>An area of surface water flooding has been identified on the southern section of the site but may be mitigated by development layout</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Mitigation required for heavy constraints. The site is partially affected by and adjacent to moderate/ significant flowpath flooding. A large percentage of the site is unaffected by surface water flooding.</p>	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		<p>Open views across the countryside, sporadic settlements clustered with small areas of woodland</p> <p>ALC – Grade 3</p>	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>When WOO01 is developed the site would form a natural extension/ clustering to the settlement without encroaching significantly into the wider landscape. Without the development of WOO01 however site would be separated from the built form and would appear an anomaly in the landscape.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Green	<p>Development would have a neutral impact on the townscape – the site is well contained, adjacent to WOO1 allocation and the Ravens Den Community Wood.</p> <p>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Amber. The only design issue is that this would be becoming essentially a very elongated cul-de-sac.</p>	Amber

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Woodland to the south of the site – impact of the development could be mitigated. Ecology survey required. NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Land adjacent to Deciduous Woodland Priority Habitat. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green. No heritage issues. HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space. Site could potentially include linkages to adjacent community woodland.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC have raised concerns about the suitability of the local highway network (but this was for a larger site area). NCC to confirm suitability. NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Crossroads junction (The Street/Hempnall Road/Chapel Hill) is poor and the Hempnall Road/B1332 junction is very poor. The Street itself is narrow, with limited footways, restricted forward visibility and a poor junction with the B1332, and the junction accessing the existing allocation is not ideal, therefore not supported in Highways terms.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Allocated housing site/ woodland/ agricultural land	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact on heritage issues and no adverse impact on the existing townscape if the adjacent allocation progresses – without this the site would appear detached within the landscape	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Not at present – the site is adjacent to agricultural land, a community woodland and a private farmyard	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with slurry pits in one corner	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Community woodland to the south – would need to ensure that the site did not encroach on this space; agricultural	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site is level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	A mixture of trees and hedgerows – these are variable in their density around the site	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Access onto the site wasn't possible so this was difficult to assess – there may be one/two trees that it would be preferable to design into the scheme. Proximity to the community woodland may increase the ecological interest of the site although this area appears to be well utilised by the community which may have impacted on its ecological value.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Slurry pits noted in south west corner of the site. Utility pole along the western boundary of the site	

Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is relatively well enclosed within the existing landscape due to the existing built form of Woodton, the adjacent woodland and the site boundaries. Development of the site could only progress after the land to the east and therefore would also be read in the context of this new development. Presently there are views further to the north west towards the school and the playing fields.	
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)	This site will be well related to the settlement, services and will not encroach significantly into the landscape once the existing allocation progresses however without this development it is difficult to determine how this site could successfully be brought forward	Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown (but owned by a developer)	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments: The revised submission details do not include a timescale as set out above, however historically throughout the District the site promoter is known to develop sites promptly – to be clarified	

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>	No additional evidence has been submitted to support the deliverability of the site but the promoter has a proven record within the District for developing similar sites	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Removal of slurry beds, possible highways constraints to be addressed	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No additional information submitted	Amber

Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	The developer has suggested that the site would be connected with the existing community woodland	
--	---	--

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p><i>Suitability</i> The site is considered to be suitable for development, subject to the adjacent site WOO01 being brought forward. Indicative plans indicate that through design the areas known to be at risk of surface water flooding can be avoided. Existing slurry pits on the site are redundant and the site promoter has confirmed that these would be removed however wider concerns about the highways network have been identified and it is not considered possible to overcome these issues.</p> <p><i>Site Visit Observations</i> On the basis that the adjacent land/site is progressed then this would appear to be a well related site that would not impact significantly on the wider landscape. If the existing allocation does not progress then it would appear detached from the existing built form and site accessibility would be an issue.</p> <p><i>Local Plan Designations</i> There are no conflicting LP designations</p> <p><i>Availability</i> The site promoter has not advised a timescale for the development of this site however the developer has a proven track record for timely delivery within the District</p> <p><i>Achievability</i> Subject to the delivery of WOO01 access to the site will be achievable however wider highway network concerns have been identified. The promoter/ developer has advised that the redundant slurry beds will be removed from the site.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: This site is unreasonable. Whilst the site initially appears to be an obvious extension to an existing allocation, development on that site was allowed recognising that there were existing traffic movements associated with the former use of the site. There are however constraints at the crossroads junction (The Street/Hempnall Road/ Chapel Hill) and the Hempnall Road/B1332 junction. The Street itself is also narrow, with restricted forward visibility, and a poor junction with the B1332. On this basis it is not considered appropriate to extend the current allocation on the basis of the impact on the wider highway network.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 6th August 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0262
Site address	Land north of Church Road, Woodton, NR35 2NB
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated / greenfield
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.055ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation (the site has been promoted for 30-36 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	34dph at 36 dwellings 26 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>No existing access but site has road frontage along Church Road and access is likely to be achievable however NCC Highways to confirm. The site is also adjacent to the junction with Norwich Road which may result in highways concerns.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. No access to be via B1332 Norwich Road. Subject to provision of acceptable visibility onto Church Road and demonstration of adequate visibility at Church Road/B1332 junction. Ensure Church Road between the site and B1332 to at least 5.5m Widen existing f/w to 2.0m at site frontage, extend f/w at south side of Church Road westwards to play area access and provide a suitable facility to enable a safe footway crossing away from the junction with B1332 Norwich Road. Widen footway from site to village school. <i>(NCC Highways meeting 16/12/20: – a combination of development on [SN0262/SN0268/SN0278] would be preferable in highways terms, the junction with the B1332 has been improved, and there is pedestrian access to the school through the new recreation area.)</i></p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	<p>Local services include primary school, public transport route, play area</p> <p>Primary school – approximately 230m</p> <p>Bus route – adjacent to the site</p> <p>Play area – opposite the site</p> <p>PH & village stores – approximately 890m</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		(see above)	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utilities capacity to be checked	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known infrastructure constraints on the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an area affected by the ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known contamination or ground stability issues NCC M&W – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site proceeds as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green

Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Some areas to the east of the site are at risk of flooding but this could be mitigated through design</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Significant ponding present in the 1:30, 1:100 and 1:1000 year rainfall events as identified on the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps in the south east corner the site up to 0.6m in depth. Watercourse not apparent on DRN mapping (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). Surface water mapping is a proxy for flooding from the ordinary watercourse (fluvial not pluvial). Would recommend that development outside areas of flood risk is considered. Not served by AW connection. Access and egress across the site should also be considered</p>	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		<p>B1 - Tas Tributary Farmland - open landscapes with sporadic settlements and areas of woodland</p> <p>ALC – Grade 3</p>	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Development would have an impact on the landscape due to the open nature of the landscape in this area</p> <p>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER – would prefer to see linear development on this site combined with SN0268SL.</p>	Amber

Townscape	Amber	The site is slightly removed from the main settlement and the closest development is linear in form (as opposed to 'estate-style'). A similar form of design would help mitigate the impact on the townscape	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Note a potential pond on the site to the north-east – potential for impact on biodiversity but this could likely be mitigated NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	LB's to the north and the east of the site. Impact on the farmhouse to the north to be assessed by the Heritage Officer SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Amber. Concerns regarding the setting of the Grade II Manor Farmhouse facing towards the houses. HES – Amber	Amber

Open Space	Green	No impact on the existing open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>NCC Highways previously raised concerns about the potential impact on the highway network. NCC to advise.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. No access to be via B1332 Norwich Road. Subject to provision of acceptable visibility onto Church Road and demonstration of adequate visibility at Church Road/B1332 junction. Ensure Church Road between the site and B1332 to at least 5.5m. Widen existing f/w to 2.0m at site frontage, extend f/w at south side of Church Road westwards to play area access and provide a suitable facility to enable a safe footway crossing away from the junction with B1332 Norwich Road. Widen footway from site to village school.</p> <p><i>(NCC Highways meeting 16/12/20: – a combination of development on these sites would be preferable in highways terms, the junction with the B1332 has been improved, and there is pedestrian access to the school through the new recreation area.)</i></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	To be assessed by the Conservation and Design Officer. LB immediately to the north of the site – this is currently visible in the wider landscape setting. Would suggest that LBs to the east of the site would be less affected by development in this location due to the separation by Norwich Road.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	To be checked with NCC Highways. The site has a road frontage and footway however it is also in close proximity to the junction of Church Road/ Norwich Road which may cause an issue. Also there are some levels differences between the site and the road due to the topography of the site.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Highway/ agricultural/ recreation ground (opposite the site)	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site is undulating and falls to the east (in the area closest to the road junction). This would likely affect development in this location however this area is also the most ecologically sensitive (pond) and the area at risk of surface water flooding	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	There is a small hedgerow along the road frontage and open boundaries to the rear of the promoted site (part of a larger parcel of land)	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	There is a hedgerow along the road frontage but this does not appear to be significant however there is a pond in the north east corner of the site with substantial vegetation surrounding it – this should be subject to an ecological survey if the site is allocated	

Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Apparatus crosses the western corner of the site – possibly BT apparatus	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is currently prominent in the landscape and affords views to the listed farmhouse to the north however there is development on the opposite side of Norwich Road as well as to the west of the site therefore any residential development in this location would also be viewed in this wider context	
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)	Subject to the views of the Conservation & Design Officer and NCC Highways, this would appear to be a reasonable site for development and could be brought forward in conjunction with SN0268SL.	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	There are no conflicting LP designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		Site Score (R/A/G)
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No additional information submitted at this time	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Highways improvements to facilitate access into the site; possible off-site highway works to facilitate access to the main areas of the settlement	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes – but no additional information submitted at this time	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is of an appropriate size for allocation and subject to highways and heritage issues the site is considered to be suitable for development. The ecological features identified to the north of the site may also need to be assessed.

Site Visit Observations

The site is separated from the centre of the village by the primary school and recreation ground however notwithstanding this it benefits from good connectivity. The existing linear form of development illustrates the form of development that would likely be most acceptable in this location. The greatest sensitivity for this site will be the impact of the development on the setting of the listed building to the north of the site.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations

Availability

The site is noted as being available within the first years of the plan period, however the site promoter has also noted that the land is currently tenanted.

Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable

OVERALL CONCLUSION: This site is a reasonable site for allocation, subject to it being demonstrated that there would not be unacceptable impact on the heritage asset to the north. Although separate from the main settlement it benefits from good connectivity and development in this location would be read in the context of the existing dwellings adjacent to the site. It would not have a significant detrimental impact on the wider landscape setting. Impacts on the landscape could be mitigated if this site is developed in conjunction with other sites. Allocation of this site would not need to be reliant on the allocation of SN0268SL although if appropriate they could be combined as a single allocation to the north of Woodton. However, allocation of this site should not be at the density promoted and would need to be similar to the existing linear development adjacent to the site. A combination of development across the sites SN0262, SN0268SL and SN0278 would be preferable in highway terms.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes (at a lower density than promoted for)

Rejected:

Date Completed: 6th August 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0268SL
Site address	Land north of Church Road, Woodton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated / agricultural land
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.47ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Both - settlement limit extension (due to site size) however the number of dwellings the site is promoted for would equate to a site allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	34dph (promoted for 14-16 dwellings) 11 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>No existing access to the site but this would be possible to achieve. NCC Highways to confirm</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to provision of acceptable visibility onto Church Road and demonstration of adequate visibility at Church Road/B1332 junction. Ensure Church Road between the site and B1332 to at least 5.5m Widen existing f/w to 2.0m at site frontage, extend f/w at south side of Church Road westwards to play area access and provide a suitable facility to enable a safe footway crossing away from the junction with B1332 Norwich Road. Widen footway from site to village school.</p> <p><i>(NCC Highways meeting 16/12/20: – a combination of development on [SN0262/SN0268/SN0278] would be preferable in highways terms, the junction with the B1332 has been improved, and there is pedestrian access to the school through the new recreation area.)</i></p>	Amber

<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	Green	<p>Local services include: primary school, public transport, play area</p> <p>Primary school – approximately 500m</p> <p>Public transport – approximately 320m</p> <p>Play area – approximately 280m</p> <p>PH & village stores – approximately 1170m</p>	
		(see above)	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utilities capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known utilities infrastructure constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>No known contamination or ground stability issues</p> <p>NCC M&W – this site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site progresses as an allocation then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green

Flood Risk	Green	No identified areas of flooding or flood risk LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. There is no surface water risk identified on this site as shown in the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. Watercourse not apparent (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). No AW connection.	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		B1 – Tas Tributary Farmland – open countryside with sporadic settlements and small pockets of woodland ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Minor impact on the landscape setting due to the small scale of development proposed SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER would prefer to see linear development on this site combined with SN0262.	Green
Townscape	Green	If linear development, this would continue the existing linear form of development. Site is removed from the main settlement but would be read in the context of the existing row of dwellings. Preference would be for development in conjunction with SN0262.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Due to proximity of wooded area an ecological survey may be necessary NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber

Historic Environment	Green	<p>LBs in the vicinity of the site, including a Church however this is some distance from the site with good separation and no visual connectivity</p> <p>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green. Fewer issues than with SN0262.</p> <p>HES – Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Previously scored as amber in the GNLPA HELAA due to concerns about the local road network. NCC Highways to advise.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to provision of acceptable visibility onto Church Road and demonstration of adequate visibility at Church Road/B1332 junction. Ensure Church Road between the site and B1332 to at least 5.5m. Widen existing f/w to 2.0m at site frontage, extend f/w at south side of Church Road westwards to play area access and provide a suitable facility to enable a safe footway crossing away from the junction with B1332 Norwich Road. Widen footway from site to village school.</p> <p><i>(NCC Highways meeting 16/12/20: – a combination of development on [SN0262/SN0268/SN0278] would be preferable in highways terms, the junction with the B1332 has been improved, and there is pedestrian access to the school through the new recreation area.)</i></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	There is good separation from the proposed site and the church therefore there are no heritage issues. The site is separate from the main settlement area however it is adjacent to an existing row of semi-detached properties and a similar design would read as a continuation of this linear development pattern (see also SN0262)	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Road frontage access achievable onto Church Road. Safe access to the highway appears to be achievable. Existing footway running along the site frontage and leading into the recreation ground and main village area to the south	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site appears to be largely level with no significant changes in levels however it was densely covered in vegetation at the time of the site visit	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open site boundaries to the north and west as the land forms part of a larger parcel. There is a vegetation along the southern boundary (road frontage)	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No obvious ecological issues however the boundary hedgerow to the south would need to be removed to allow access to the site – to be checked by the Landscape Officer	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	None that are obvious	

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 currently restricted due to the front boundary hedgerow however further to the north and west there is an existing tree belt/ boundary line which is visible. There are wider open views to the south of the site on the opposite side of Church 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)	As an extension to the existing linear development a similar form of housing would be acceptable in this location, although for a lower number of dwellings than the land is promoted for. Development of this site would be more coherent in terms of creating a 'feeling of place' if the site is developed alongside SN0262.	Green

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

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>	No additional information submitted	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes – upgrades will be required to the access and possibly to the road network. Possible crossing across Church Rd required. NCC to advise.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes but no additional information submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

If brought forward in conjunction with SN0262 the site is considered to be suitable for development and no significant constraints have been identified. The site has been promoted as an extension to the settlement limit but for a larger number of dwellings. Development on this site would need to be a lower number than it has been promoted for and should be linear in form to complement the existing row of dwellings.

Site Visit Observations

With appropriate design a linear development would complement the existing row of dwellings adjacent to the site however in terms of the wider landscape impact this would only be preferable if the nearby site SN0262 is also allocated. Development would not impact on identified heritage assets. The boundary hedgerow should be assessed by the Landscape Officer for its significance. Access onto Church Road appears to be achievable and despite the separation of the site from the centre of the settlement the site is well connected.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations

Availability

The promoter has advised that the site is available for development within the first 5 years of the plan period, however they have also advised that the land is currently tenanted.

Achievability

The promoter has advised that the site is viable, including with a provision of affordable housing however it is not considered appropriate to develop the site at a scale that would trigger a requirement for affordable housing unless the site is allocated as part of a larger allocation alongside SN0262.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be a REASONABLE site for allocation if combined with SN0262. A linear form of development would complement the existing semi-detached properties. However, as a standalone SL site, it is not considered that this would be an appropriate location for development due to its separation from the main area of development within the settlement.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes (at a lower density)

Rejected:

Date Completed: 6th August 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0278
Site address	Land south of Church Road, Woodton, NR35 2NB
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated/ greenfield/ agricultural
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.1ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation (Promoted for up to 50 dwellings, village shop, land for replacement village hall, POS and community garden)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	16 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>The site has a road frontage and access appears to be achievable by all means. Previously scored AMBER in the HELAA prepared by the GNLP. NCC Highways to advise whether access is achievable.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to provision of acceptable visibility onto Church Road and demonstration of adequate visibility at Church Road/B1332 junction. Ensure Church Road between the site and B1332 to at least 5.5m. Provide 2m wide footway across the site frontage towards B1332. Widen footway from site to village school.</p> <p><i>(NCC Highways meeting 16/12/20: – a combination of development on [SN0262/SN0268/SN0278] would be preferable in highways terms, the junction with the B1332 has been improved, and there is pedestrian access to the school through the new recreation area)</i></p>	Amber

<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	Green	<p>The site lies within close proximity to the local primary school and playing fields, as well as the village amenities.</p> <p>Primary school – adjacent to the site</p> <p>Playing fields – adjacent to the site</p> <p>Bus service – approximately 450m</p> <p>PH & Village stores – approximately 450m</p>	
		(see above)	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed for the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	<p>No known utilities infrastructure connection issues</p> <p>AW advise sewers crossing the site</p>	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>No known ground stability or contamination issues on the site</p> <p>NCC M&W – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site proceeds as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green

Flood Risk	Green	<p>The GNLP HELAA scored the flood risk as AMBER. Additional supporting information has been submitted indicating that the site is not in an area at risk of flooding</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Small areas of surface water risk identified in the 1:1000 year rainfall event as shown on the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. Watercourse apparent 40m from the south eastern boundary of the site (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). Not served by AW connection.</p>	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		<p>B1 – Tas Tributary Farmland – open landscapes with sporadic settlements and pockets of woodland</p> <p>ALC – Grade 3</p>	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>A significant parcel of land in an open landscape – development of this site could have an adverse impact on the local landscape without appropriate mitigation measures. Design officer to provide comment.</p> <p>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER - General concerns about site connectivity . The setting of the new recreation facility was carefully negotiated, so would need to take this into account if allocating this site.</p>	Amber

Townscape	Amber	<p>The promoted site is of a significant scale and is slightly removed from the main settlement which is further to the south of the site. Development could be located to the south of the site to 'cluster' it with the existing built form however this would result in an unfortunate access road/driveway; development to the north of the site would appear incongruous as a standalone site however if allocated alongside SN0262 and SN0268SL this would create a new focus for the village.</p> <p>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Amber. Would agree development to the south of the site. There are Taylor & Green bungalows to the south but that does not necessarily preclude development. Awkward access from the north if developing to the south.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>The site previously scored an AMBER in the GNLP HELAA exercise. An ecological survey has subsequently been submitted confirming that the site would not have a significant impact although it would affect a 'Hedgerow Habitat of Principal Importance' along the eastern boundary. For this reason to RAG score remains.</p> <p>NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>There are LBs to the north and north-east of the site although there is some separation and impacts are not considered to be significant. Heritage officer to comment.</p> <p>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green</p> <p>HES – Amber</p>	Green

Open Space	Green	No loss of POS	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Previously scored AMBER due to NCC Highways concerns about the local highway network. NCC Highways to provide comment.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to provision of acceptable visibility onto Church Road and demonstration of adequate visibility at Church Road/B1332 junction. Ensure Church Road between the site and B1332 to at least 5.5m. Provide 2m wide footway across the site frontage towards B1332. Widen footway from site to village school.</p> <p><i>(NCC Highways meeting 16/12/20: – a combination of development on [SN0262/SN0268/SN0278] would be preferable in highways terms, the junction with the B1332 has been improved, and there is pedestrian access to the school through the new recreation area)</i></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/ residential/ recreational	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>The site is some distance from the heritage assets to the north and therefore would not have a significant impact on these.</p> <p>Development to the centre/ north of the promoted parcel of land would have the greatest impact on the townscape due to its relative separation from the existing developments. Development alongside SN0262 and SN0268SL would be improve the acceptability of this, creating a cluster of dwellings that relate to each other. Development to the south would have a reduced landscape impact as it would be clustered adjacent to existing dwellings (principally single storey in form) however access would need to be obtained from Church Road to the north which would create an unfortunate access road through the site.</p>	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could only be obtained via Church Road to the north where the site has a road frontage. There is an existing footpath on the opposite side of Church Road.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential/ agricultural/ recreation ground	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The topography of the site is undulating – the land gently falls away to the existing development at the southern boundary. These dwellings therefore have a lesser impact in the wider landscape setting.	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows and open boundaries	

Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No obvious additional features (subject to comments above)	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	BT poles along the site frontage and power lines along the western boundary	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is prominent within the wider landscape and has minimal built form surrounding it at present. The southern sections of the site are less visible due to the topography of the land. Existing residential development to the south is not particularly visible in the wider landscape due to its form and character and the changes in levels. This site currently marks the transition from the rural environ into the edges of the village.	
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)	The site is larger than is being sought as part of this process and at the scale promoted would be detrimental to the wider landscape setting. A reduced number of dwellings would need to be agreed on the site. Development to the south of the site would be most appropriate with the current form of development in Woodton, however if sites to the north of Church Road are allocated development to the north of this site would be preferable.	Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private – multiple ownership	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	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>	Additional plans and technical details have been submitted to support the promotion of the site, including a	Green

	letter of support from SAFFRON housing	
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Highways improvements may be required for access in particular – NCC to advise	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes. In addition, a letter of support has been provided from SAFFRON (although this would need to be checked if the numbers were reduced on the site)	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Yes – the promoter of the site refers to a village shop, community garden (for school usage) and POS (however this scale of development is not considered to be acceptable).	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is too large for development in its promoted scale as it would be an inappropriate addition to the settlement. Development clustered to the north of the site, alongside allocations SN0262 and SN0268SL, would be the preferred form and location of development on this site. Landscape considerations have been noted, including the impact on the landscaping of adjacent recreation ground which would be impacted by development on this site.

Site Visit Observations

The site is prominent in the landscape and marks the transition from the countryside to the edge of the village. Development within the northern section of the site would have a greater impact on the wider landscape setting and would be less sympathetic to the existing character of the immediate area if it was allocated as a standalone site; development alongside other sites promoted for allocation and to the north of Church Road would therefore be preferable as this would result in a more coherent grouping of dwellings. Development to the south of the site would be less intrusive and more in keeping with the existing wider setting but would raise issues regarding access arrangements.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations

Availability

The site is considered to be available within a timely manner

Achievability

Subject to the constraints noted above the site is considered to be achievable. It is also noted that the site has been promoted with a number of additional benefits. The affordable housing is supported by SAFFRON Housing. However, this would be based upon the delivery of a significantly larger site which is not currently being supported.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: As a smaller allocation than is currently promoted the site is considered to be a reasonable site for development. This assessment is based upon a smaller site area and number of dwellings than the site is promoted for. Also that it is demonstrated that it can be developed to address highway concerns whilst minimising landscape impacts.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 6th August 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0452
Site address	Land south east of The Street, Woodton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated/ greenfield
Planning History	2020/0099 & 2018/2780 – REFUSALS – 4x dwellings on the site – Landscape impact
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	6.8 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation (Promoted for approximately 30x dwellings in phase 1 of site development)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	4 dph (due to overall size of site – if allocated a smaller section of the site should be allocated only) 170 dwellings at 25dph (across the whole site)
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	A small area of FZ 3 along part of the site frontage
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>The site has road frontage access but the GNLP HELAA scored the site as Amber for this category due to concerns about the suitability of the road network.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Substandard visibility from Hempnall Road north to B1332, access to Hempnall Rd cannot be accepted. Access onto The Street would require widening of existing footway. Lack of footway on The Street south of the site & substandard junction between The Street & B1332. Allocation too large for location.</p>	Red

<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	Green	<p>The site is well connected to the local services, including bus stops adjacent to the south-west corner of the site and:</p> <p>Primary school – within approximately 150metres of the northern section of the site</p> <p>Public house & village store – within approximately 670metres of the northern section of the site</p>	
		<p>Recreation facilities – within approximately 250 metres of the northern section of the site</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste water capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	<p>No known connection issues identified.</p> <p>Aw advise sewers cross this site.</p>	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within an area affected by the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known ground stability or contamination issues	Green

Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood zones 2 & 3 identified along parts of the northern boundary and in the north west corner of the site however the site is of sufficient size that these areas could be avoided</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Small areas of surface water risk identified in the 1:1000 year rainfall event as shown on the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. Watercourse apparent along the northern boundary of the site (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). Not served by AW connection.</p>	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		<p>B1 Tas Tributary Farmland – open countryside with sporadic settlements with pockets of woodland areas</p> <p>ALC – Grade 3</p>	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is of significant scale within the landscape in its promoted form and would need to be reduced in size. Development along Norwich Road (to the east) would have a significant impact on the wider landscape setting of the settlement when approached from this direction.	Green

Townscape	Amber	In its current form (without reduction) the scale of the development would not be characteristic of the existing built form – a smaller scale scheme could be designed to be more in keeping with the locality however this would need to address the constraints that have been identified. Smaller sections of this site have also been promoted – SN2130 and SN2100	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	The GNLP HELAA noted that some boundary features should be protected if this site were to be allocated NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to Priority habitat - traditional orchard. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	There are both designated and non-designated heritage assets in close proximity to the site boundaries, including the Kings Head to the north of the site. The detrimental impact of development on this non-designated asset was a key reason for refusal in the recent planning applications. HES – Amber	Amber

Open Space	Green	There would be no impact on existing open space provision	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC Highways have previously raised concerns about the impact of development on the local road network; NCC Highways may need to assess the impact arising from a smaller site area if this site is carried forward NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Substandard visibility from Hempnall Road north to B1332, access to Hempnall Rd cannot be accepted. Access onto The Street would require widening of existing footway. Lack of footway on The Street south of the site & substandard junction between The Street & B1332. Allocation too large for location.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Large scale development could have an impact on the adjacent Kings Head PH which has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Achieving an access to the north of the site along The Street may be difficult due to the watercourse running along this site frontage – existing properties are set back and have small bridge crossings to their properties. There is an existing footpath along The Street.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural – no impact on neighbouring dwellings	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential, PH, agricultural, highway	

What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Undulating – the land falls to the west and the south – the site is prominent in the landscape, especially along Norwich Road to the east	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open boundaries along The Street – vegetation in other areas	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	See SN2100 re. boundaries for potential landscape issues for this section of the site	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	There is some apparatus crossing the site – possibly BT (see above box re. utilities), as well as along The Street frontage.	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is located within an older part of the settlement and this feels like a central part of the village. Existing dwellings are set back from the road frontage which improves the visibility and reduces the impact of these properties. The site itself forms a gateway into the settlement when approaching via Norwich Road/ The Street, forming a pleasing aspect.	
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)	The site is too large for development as promoted (see also SN2130 and SN2100) and for this reason is not considered appropriate for development. In addition, access into the site would be problematic and there would be a landscape impact associated with developing this 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)
Flood zones 2 & 3	These areas affect a small area within the site only	
Conclusion	As above – this could be mitigated by site layout	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	X	Green
	Within 5 years		
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments: The land is not tenanted & is in single ownership		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional)</i>	No additional evidence has been submitted to support viability	Amber

<i>information to be included as appropriate)</i>		
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Potential highways upgrades required pending NCC Highways comments; access across the watercourse would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes but no additional information submitted	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified/ promoted	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

In its current form the site is considered to be too large although smaller parcels are also being considered separately (SN2130 and SN2100) For this reason, smaller parcels of this site have not been considered as part of this assessment. Large scale development would not be in keeping with the immediate townscape and there would be wider highways, landscape, flooding and heritage issues to address.

Site Visit Observations

The site is excessive in scale and would need to be reduced significantly in size. Access into the site appears to be problematic with the main access point being to the north and needing to cross a waterway. Access to the south also appears to be difficult. Development of this site would have a significant impact on the wider landscape setting of the settlement, particularly when approached from the east. Development close to the site is set back from the road frontage so a similar design approach would likely be necessary.

Local Plan Designations

Some areas of identified flood zone to address with development of this site however this could be mitigated by layout/ design.

Availability

The site is considered to be available immediately.

Achievability

Additional viability should be sought if this site is considered further for allocation to ensure that the costs associated with accessing the site, as well as any wider road network improvements would not affect the delivery of affordable housing on this site.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: This site is considered to be unreasonable due to its scale and the adverse impact that this would have on the wider landscape setting. There also appear to be access constraints to this site which would be difficult to overcome satisfactorily.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 5th August 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN1009SL
Site address	Land at the junction of Chapel Road and Sunnyside
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated/ greenfield
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.42 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Settlement limit extension (The site has been promoted for up to 11 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	26dph at 11 dwellings 10 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>The site has road frontage access to both Sunnyside and Chapel Road, however this would require the removal of trees on the boundary and Highways have previously commented to the GNLP HELAA that site access would be severely constrained</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Unlikely to achieve adequate visibility. Access to Chapel Hill would require complete removal of existing tree/hedges, 2m wide frontage footway and localised widening to 5.5m.</p>	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	<p>The site is accessible in relation to existing services including:</p> <p>Public house – approximately 200m</p> <p>Primary school – approximately 715m</p> <p>Convenience store – approximately 200m</p> <p>Recreation ground – approximately 850m</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		(see above)	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not in an area identified as being within the ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known contamination or ground stability issues NCC M&W – this site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site progresses as an allocation then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Areas of surface water flooding identified on the site	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	X
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1 Tas Tributary Farmland – open landscape with sporadic settlements and woodland blocks. ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Loss of the trees on the site – the trees contribute to the wider setting and are characteristic of the landscape character area.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Small scale linear development on the site would be compatible with the existing form of development adjacent to the site and would round off the corner at the junction of Sunnyside and Chapel Road.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	The site is opposite a County Wildlife Site; significant trees along the site boundaries. NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No impact on heritage assets identified HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC Highways have previously raised concerns to the GNLP regarding the capacity of the road network NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The wider local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted road width along Chapel Hill, Knaves Lane & Church Road. Substandard visibility at junction of Hempnall Road / B1332. No continuous footway to the village primary school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact on heritage assets in proximity to the site however the site is currently well screened with the vegetation forming an important rural approach into Woodton via Chapel Road. Loss of this would impact on the wider setting. Development in the location is minimal and/or linear in form so any development in this location would be restricted to being of a similar form.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Unlikely- Sunnyside to the south is a track with access to a few properties further to the west only. Chapel Road is narrow is mainly single car width only alongside this site. There are no existing footpath linkages from the site to the existing footpath network.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Equestrian grazing (agricultural)	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site rises to the north west although access into the site was not possible so it is difficult to assess the changes in topography – they are however considerable on the opposite side of Chapel Road	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Significant vegetation along all of the site boundaries, especially those long Chapel Road and Sunnyside	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Yes – see above re. vegetation. If the site progresses then these should be assessed by the Landscape Officer.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No – cables run alongside Sunnyside and land further to the south but these do not appear to cross the promoted site	

Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into and out of the site are extremely restricted due to the dense vegetation along the site boundaries. Loss of this vegetation would have an adverse impact on the landscape setting and the approach into Woodton from the south along Chapel 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)	The landscape impact of developing this site, as well as the highways constraints appear to make the development of this site inappropriate.	Red

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

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>	No additional information submitted	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes – Highways improvements are likely to be required to facilitate access into the site	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No – the site has been promoted for a level of development below the affordable housing threshold	N/A
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 development however it is constrained by both the highways network and problems achieving a safe access to the site, and the significant landscaping across the site which is a feature of the local landscape. It is not considered that these constraints could be overcome.

Site Visit Observations

The site is bounded by dense vegetation which forms an important frontage along Chapel Road and Sunnyside, as well as being the transition point between the edge of the settlement and the rural landscape beyond. Any development on this site would need to be small scale and linear in form only. Access to the site appears to be problematic due to the immediate highway constraints adjacent to the site.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations on this site

Availability

The site is considered to be available for development, although it is noted that it is in multiple land ownerships (and may currently be tenanted)

Achievability

Highways constraints appear to make this site too difficult to bring forward for development.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be unreasonable as a settlement limit extension due to the landscape impact of developing this site as well as the significant highways/ access constraints. Loss of the trees and vegetation is also considered to have an adverse impact on the wider setting.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 5th August 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2100
Site address	Land north of Hempnall Road, Woodton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Greenfield/ unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.65ha
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Both (The site is promoted for 5-10 dwellings only so would fall below the dwelling number threshold for an allocation. However, the site exceeds the 0.5ha allocation minimum allocation site size)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	15 dph at 10 dwellings 16 dwellings at 25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>The site has frontage access and NCC Highways have previously advised that access may be possible</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access would require complete removal of site frontage hedge and 2m wide frontage footway. Substandard visibility from Hempnall Road north to B1332, access to Hempnall Rd cannot be accepted. No continuous footway to the village 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 	Green	<p>Access to the required number of services within the settlement, including:</p> <p>Public house – approximately 180m</p> <p>Convenience store – approximately 240m</p> <p>Recreation ground – approximately 240m</p> <p>Primary school – approximately 200m</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		(see above)	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known infrastructure connection constraints AW advise sewers crossing this site	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area that is already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site does not lie within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site has no known contamination or ground stability issues, although it is adjacent to a sewerage pumping station NCC M&W – this site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site progresses as an allocation then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	There are no identified flood risk issues on the site, although a public representation refers to flooding of the road to the south of the site – this should be looked into if the site progresses	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	

		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1 Tas Tributary Farmland – open landscapes with sporadic settlements and pockets of woodland ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	The site is open within the landscape within minimal development adjacent to the site. Development of this site would extend beyond the existing recognisable entrance to the settlement from the east	Amber
Townscape	Amber	A small development of 5-10 dwellings that is linear in form would be more appropriate in terms of townscape however there is limited development surrounding the site and development of this site would extend the settlement into the surrounding landscape. The impact of this could not be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	There are no known biodiversity/ geodiversity issues on this site	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	The development may have some impact on the setting of some nearby listed buildings HES – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC Highways previously raised concerns about the road network as part of the GNLP HELAA NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access would require complete removal of site frontage hedge and 2m wide frontage footway. Substandard visibility from Hempnall Road north to B1332, access to Hempnall Rd cannot be accepted. No continuous footway to the village school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Sewerage pumping station; residential	Amber

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact noted on heritage assets. Development in this location would extend beyond the recognisable existing boundaries of the settlement, encroaching further into the surrounding landscape. There is very limited development on the opposite side of the road (2x dwellings) and a barn complex on the corner of Hempnall Road.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Note Highways previous comments however due to the changes in ground levels between the site and the road it is difficult to see how vehicular access could be achieved (the road is significantly lower). There is no boundary verge or footpath along this part of Hempnall Road and it is also difficult to see how this could safely be created. Hempnall Road is 2x car width but it is narrow and can be difficult to pass if meeting a larger vehicle at this section.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential; agricultural; Anglian water sewerage pumping station	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site is significantly higher than the road to the south, as well as the properties on the opposite side of Hempnall Road. Development on this site would be particularly prominent and imposing.	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	There is a mature hedgerow along the southern boundary and this would need to be removed if the site is developed	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Query whether the southern boundary is a significant hedgerow. Landscape Officer to comment if this site progresses any further.	

Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	<p>Anglian Water pumping station adjacent to west corner of site – notices refer to underground cables but it is unclear where these are. If the site is brought forward this would need to be checked with AW.</p> <p>Overhead wires along the site frontage – assume that these are BT apparatus</p>	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Currently restricted views into and out of the site in a southerly direction because of the topography and the dense hedgerow along the boundary	
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 this site would not be favourable – the site would appear to be a significant extension to the existing edge of the settlement (even with smaller scale development). The topography of the site is not favourable in terms of the landscape impact and it is difficult to see how access could be achieved.	Red

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		Site Score (R/A/G)
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No additional information has been submitted to support the allocation of this site	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes – off site highways works would be required to create a footway connection (but it is difficult to see how this could be achieved)	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No – the site has been promoted for fewer dwellings than affordable housing would be required for	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site forms a small section of a larger parcel that is being promoted separately (SN0452). The site is of a suitable size for allocation but has been promoted for a number of dwellings that would be considered as a settlement limit extension. Significant constraints have been identified on this site that would prohibit either scale of development. These constraints are highways, landscape and townscape and they could not reasonably be overcome.

Site Visit Observations

The site is at a higher level to the road to the south – access issues appear significant and may need to be reassessed. There is currently no safe pedestrian footway in place and the local highway is also constrained. The hedgerow along the site frontage is potentially a significant hedgerow and would need to be removed to allow both access visibility. The continuation of linear development along Hempnall Road in this location would extend the limits of the settlement to a degree which would be inappropriate.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting designations

Availability

The site is available for development

Achievability

Due to the number of dwellings promoted, the site promoter has not confirmed that affordable housing would be provided on the site resulting in a RED score for this criteria, an increase in dwelling numbers would trigger an affordable housing requirement and this would need to be confirmed with the site promoter. Notwithstanding this comment, for the reasons set out above, this site is not considered appropriate for a larger number of dwellings. In addition, access and highways constraints may also affect the viability of the development of this site.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: This site is considered to be unreasonable due to the landscape impact that would result from its development, in particular arising from the continued linear extension of the settlement and the overall topography of the site and the surrounding land.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 5th August 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2130
Site address	Land south of The Street
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Greenfield/ unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2ha
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocation Promoted for up to 25 dwellings (smaller parcel of land within SN0452)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12dph at 25 dwellings 50 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>The site has frontage access and NCC Highways have previously advised that access would be possible however note that the larger site scored an Amber only</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access onto The Street would require widening of site frontage footway to 2m. Wider road network poor to north and south. Substandard junction of The Street & B1332. Lack of footways to pub & shop.</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	Green	<p>The site is well connected to the local services, including bus stops adjacent to the south-west corner of the site and:</p> <p>Primary school – within approximately 150metres of the northern section of the site</p> <p>Public house & village store – within approximately 670metres of the northern section of the site</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Recreation facilities – within approximately 250 metres of the northern section of the site	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known infrastructure connection issues AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area that is already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site does not lie within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site has no known contamination or ground stability issues, although it is adjacent to a sewerage pumping station NCC M&W – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site proceeds as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	There are some identified flood issues along the boundary of the site which would affect the design and layout of development on the parcel of land being promoted (further land may be available however)	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	x
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
		B1 Tas Tributary Farmland – open landscapes with sporadic settlements and pockets of woodland ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	The site is open within the landscape with minimal development adjacent to the site. There is existing linear development on the opposite side of The Street	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Linear development along the site frontage would be in the character of development along The Street – existing properties are set back from the road frontage	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	There are no known biodiversity/ geodiversity issues on this site NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. (not sure of boundary as same as SN0452 in the GIS file) Potentially adjacent to Priority habitat- traditional orchard. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	The development may have some impact on the setting of some nearby listed buildings HES – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC Highways previously raised concerns about the road network as part of the GNLP HELAA NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access onto The Street would require widening of site frontage footway to 2m. Wider road network poor to north and south. Substandard junction of The Street & B1332. Lack of footways to pub & shop.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Sewerage pumping station; residential	Amber

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Kings Head PH to the north of the site – separated by some distance therefore not affected by development on this parcel	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would need to cross a brook – other properties have small bridges crossing the watercourse; NCC Highways would need to advise re. the practicalities of this for a larger development. Footpaths along the site frontage.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Undulating – the land rises to the south therefore at its lowest at the proposed site area	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	No significant site boundaries along The Street; no clear areas of definition/ boundaries within the site to delineate the smaller parcel of land	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	None significant on 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)	Small Anglian Water pumping station to the south of the proposed area (outside proposed boundaries)	

Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Clear views into the site from The Street; the open aspect is a feature of this part of the streetscene; undulating topography is also a clear feature of the site. Surrounding developments are predominantly set back from the road frontage within their plots (The Street) and at Woodyard Close. Overall impression is that The Street is leading towards the centre of the village to the west and development in this location would be detrimental to the streetscene.	
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)	There are issues with the allocation of this site – predominantly based on its impact on the local landscape and townscape, as well as potential access issues. Heritage Officer to comment if the site progresses	Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

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>	No additional information has been submitted to support the allocation of this site	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes – highways access would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes, but no further information has been requested/ supplied at this time	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site forms part of a larger parcel of land currently being promoted (SN0452). The site is too large and would have detrimental impact on the townscape. A reduced scale development has also been considered. Constraints have been identified that could not be reasonably mitigated, including highways, landscape and townscape concerns.

Site Visit Observations

The site provides an important open aspect within the streetscene and development of the site would have an adverse impact on this setting. Potential access issues via The Street would need to be resolved due to the presence of a brook along the site frontage.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations

Availability

The site is considered to be available

Achievability

Development of the site may be achievable, depending on the costs of access into the site as well as any upgrades to the local highway network

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be unreasonable due to the adverse impact that it would have on the townscape, as well as the landscape. The current open aspect forms an important feature of the streetscene as it leads into the more developed centre of the settlement.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 5th August 2020