



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Site Assessments

Alburgh and Denton

Contents

SN00168..... 3

SN00193..... 11

SN4011..... 20

SN4031SL 32

SN5034..... 42

SN5054SL 51

SN5055SL 60

SN00168

Part 1 Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN00168
Site address	Land at north of Upland Terrace Council houses, Norwich Road, Denton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.13ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	4 Dwellings But given the size of the site put forward would assume 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
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	Potential access constraints existing hedge/trees to site frontage. A narrow Road with no footpaths. NCC Highways – Amber, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Primary School○ Secondary school○ Local healthcare services○ Retail services○ Local employment opportunities○ Peak-time public transport	Red	No village Shop Bus stop within 1.41km (Trunch Hill, turns around at Chapel Corner) and is on the bus route for Anglian 84 Primary School is within 3.73km	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Village Hall 1.09km Recreational ground/play area 1.11km Pre-school at the primary school Denton Community Post Office 1.41km (Thursdays in vestry of Chapel)	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, sewage and electricity available to site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface Water Flooding to the south and east running along the frontage with the highway but not on the site.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B4 – Waveney Tributary Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Green	The site is detached from the main part of the village. The site is currently used as an agricultural field. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Mutts Farm located to the west, Glebe farm to the east, Old Kings head to the northeast. All separated by intervening land uses; therefore, any impact could be reasonably mitigated. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on functioning of local road network and junction capacity which may not be reasonably mitigated. NCC advised that the local road network is considered unsuitable in terms of road capacity and lack of footpath provision. NCC Highways – Red, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and Residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB' s.</p> <p>The site is detached from the main part of the village. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character. Therefore, the development would have a detrimental impact on townscape, which could not be reasonably mitigated.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on surrounding road network.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural field Grade 3	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Public right of way running from the southwest corner along the western boundary. Trees/hedgerows to the boundaries. Residential to the part of the south	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees along the boundaries. As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations. Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from surrounding road network, public footpath and the surrounding landscape due to boundaries of the site being lower hedgerows.	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not adjacent to the development boundary, separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network, public footpath. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.	Amber/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 (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Potential off-site highway improvements. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	Not applicable

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable due to potential adverse impacts on landscape and separation for the main part of the village, poor connectivity along narrow, rural roads to local services/facilities.

Site Visit Observations

Separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network, public footpath. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and not adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Unreasonable – The site as promoted extends to over 3ha, although the site promoter has indicated that a much smaller scheme (circa 4 dwellings) is being sought. Notwithstanding this, the site would extend a small group of former Council Houses in a location which is detached from the main part of the village (which lies to the south) and would erode the rural character of the locality. The site is well beyond 3km from the catchment primary school and connectivity to local services is poor.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 25/11/2020

SN00193

Part 1 Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN00193
Site address	Land at Upland Farm, Denton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	DE/6450 Site for a bungalow and garage. Refused DE/3513 Use of land for the erection of 5 dwellings. Refused DE/3497 use of land for residential development. Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	5.64ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	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:	Response
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	Potential access constraints existing hedge/trees to site frontage. A narrow Road with no footpaths. NCC Highways – Amber, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Primary School○ Secondary school○ Local healthcare services○ Retail services○ Local employment opportunities○ Peak-time public transport	Red	No village Shop Bus stop within 1.41km (Trunch Hill, turns around at Chapel Corner) and is on the bus route for Anglian 84 Primary School is within 3.73km	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Village Hall 1.09km Recreational ground/play area 1.11km Pre-school at the primary school Denton Community Post Office 1.41km (Thursdays in vestry of Chapel)	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site. No – mains sewage (which conflicts with the promoter on the site opposite) existing properties use a septic tank.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface water flooding 1-1000 and Surface Water flood hazard peppered around the sites. 1:100 and 1:30 to the middle section of 1172 and 1960.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	Not applicable	B4 – Waveney Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Green	The site is detached from the main part of the village. The site is currently used as an agricultural field. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Mutts Farm located to the west separated by intervening land uses. Old kings head located to north separated by the highways. Glebe Farm is located below 1960 separated from the proposed sites by outbuildings and Upland Farm complex. Therefore, any impact could be reasonably mitigated. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on functioning of local road network and junction capacity which may not be reasonably mitigated. NCC advised that the local road network is considered unsuitable in terms of road capacity and lack of footpath provision.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural, residential and Ashton Motors small commercial garage/mots is located to the western boundary adjacent the highway.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB' s.</p> <p>The site is detached from the main part of the village. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character. Therefore, the development would have a detrimental impact on townscape, which could not be reasonably mitigated.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on surrounding road network	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural field Grade 3	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural, residential and Ashton Motors small commercial garage/mots is located to the western boundary adjacent the highway.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow and trees to the eastern and northern boundaries with the highway. Field boundaries separate the parcels of land. Residential to the south and Ashton motors to the west.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees along the boundaries. As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations. Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead lines run along the western highway boundary with the sites	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from surrounding road network, and the surrounding landscape due to boundaries of the site with the highway being lower hedgerows. Some parcels more contained within the site, due to boundary treatment and location.	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not adjacent to the development boundary, separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.	Amber/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 (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Potential off-site highway improvements. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	Not applicable

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable due to potential adverse impacts on landscape and separation for the main part of the village, poor connectivity along narrow, rural roads to local services/facilities.

Site Visit Observations

Separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and not adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Not reasonable – The site as promoted extends to over 5ha; however, even a smaller element of the site would be detached from the main part of the village (which lies to the south) and would effectively be an isolated group of dwellings in the countryside, eroding the rural character of the locality. The site is well beyond 3km from the catchment primary school and connectivity to local services is poor.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 25/11/2020

SN4011

Part 1 Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4011
Site address	Land to South and West of Church Road Alburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	DE/9944 Outline residential development – Refused DE/9943 Outline residential development – Refused DE/9942 Outline residential development – Refused 1974/0193 Residential development - Refused 1978/2595 Erection of Detached House and Double Garage – Refused 1978/2594 Erection of Detached House and Double Garage - Refused 1980/2529 Site for Ten Dwellings - Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.96ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Minimum of 12 dwellings therefore assuming 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:	Response
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		<p>Potential access constraints existing hedge/trees to site frontage.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Green, narrow carriageway, no footway.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting – Site has plenty of frontage to form a safe access(es). Not an appropriate location for estate scale development/estate roads. Therefore, frontage only from private drives (up to 12/13 dwellings total), ideally turning the corner to maximise the benefits of any frontage improvements. Roads are not ideal for walking – however, Church Road/Low Road are wide enough for 2 cars to pass.</p>	Amber/Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<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>No village Shop</p> <p>Bus stop within 232m and is on the bus route for Anglian 84</p> <p>Primary School is within 1.1km</p> <p>No footpaths</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Village Hall 264m</p> <p>Recreational ground/play area next to village hall 264m</p> <p>Public House 2.59m (A143)</p> <p>Pre-school at the primary school</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity		Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure		Promoter advises water, sewage and electricity available to site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability		<p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.</p> <p>SNC Environmental Services Land Quality, Green:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No potentially contaminated sites are located within 500m of the site in question on the PCLR or Landmark databases. Nothing of concern with regard to land quality noted on the historic OS maps <p>Having regard to the size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application.</p>	Green
Flood Risk		<p>Flood zone 1 with Small area of 1-100, 1-1000, 1 – 30 and Surface Water Flood Risk on the southern boundary and Surface Water Flood Hazard .</p> <p>LLFA - Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage.</p> <p>AW advise sewers crossing the site</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment		<p>Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>SNC Landscape Meeting - Significant landscape concerns about this site due to the loss of the frontage hedgerow that would result. Loss of the hedgerow would conflict with Policy DM4.8.</p>	Amber
Townscape		<p>Adjacent to development boundary, area characterised by linear development opposite and to the northwest. Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated, should the development be a linear form.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity		<p>Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Ecology – Green, potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment		<p>Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB located to the south but could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Alburgh Old Hall Farm is a grade 2 listed building, the promoted site forms part of its setting. Archaeology on the listed building site to the south.</p> <p>All Saints Church Grade 1 and War memorial Grade 11 to the east separated by the highway. Church Farm Grade 11 to northeast and Old Forge Cottage Grade 11 opposite side of the road to northwest.</p> <p>SNC Heritage & Design</p> <p>There are some good views across the field towards the Farmhouse – which also includes views of the church tower, which can be seen to the left. Would suggest excluding the area west of the driveway.</p> <p>Area east of the driveway, amber for heritage– it would be good to leave some space for the setting of LB</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space		Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads		<p>Potential impact on functioning of Church Road/road network may not be reasonably mitigated. Narrow carriage way and no footway</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, narrow carriageway, no footway.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting – Site has plenty of frontage to form a safe access(es). Not an appropriate location for estate scale development/estate roads. Therefore, frontage only from private drives (up to 12/13 dwellings total), ideally turning the corner to maximise the benefits of any frontage improvements. Roads are not ideal for walking – however, Church Road/Low Road are wide enough for 2 cars to pass.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses		<p>Agricultural/residential</p> <p>SNC Environmental Services Amenity, Green: - No issues observed.</p>	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB' s, particularly Alburgh Old Hall Farm . Noted that the other Listed buildings are separated by roads.</p> <p>This part of the village is characterised by linear development opposite and to the northwest. Therefore, the development would have a detrimental impact on townscape, however this could be reasonably mitigated, should the development be a linear form along the site frontage.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints as there are existing hedge/trees to site frontage.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural Grade 3	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees/hedgerows to north and east. Residential to the part of the south and west with remainder trees/vegetation.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees along the northern and eastern boundaries. As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations. Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	None	Not applicable
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 limited due to existing residential development bounding the site to the west and existing hedges/trees screen the site from Church Road. However, the development would be visible from the surrounding road network.	Not applicable
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)	Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated.	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 (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Likely off-site highway improvements. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	Not applicable

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services, although there are no footways, the roads are generally two car widths, and the routes to the school and village hall are relatively short. The site is within the setting of the Grade II Listed Alburgh Old Hall Farm, and within the wider setting of the Grade I listed church. The extensive frontage hedgerows are also a limitation, as is a small area of 1:30 year surface water flood risk.

Site Visit Observations

It would represent a breakout to the village, However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably be mitigated. Concern that the site has extensive roadside hedges would need to be removed to maintain the linear, frontage characteristics of the village.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Unreasonable – The site is relatively well located for access to the school and village hall and creating accesses for frontage accesses (although improvements sought by Highways could urbanise this rural location). Linear, frontage development would also be in keeping with the character of this part of the village; however, this form of development would require the loss of extensive roadside hedging. The site is in the setting of a listed building and also has views across to the Grade 1 listed church, meaning that development at the western end of the site (either side of the Old Hall Farm drive) would have a detrimental impact on the setting of these designated heritage assets. This would leave the eastern end of the site as a potential Settlement Limit extension; however, this would not justify the hedgerow/habitat loss.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 24/10/2020

SN4031SL

Part 1 Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4031SL
Site address	Land adjacent to no1 Station Road Alburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2014/0451 Erection of code level 6 dwelling, including an observatory (Para 55) Refused. Dismissed at Appeal 2016/0526 Detached 4 bedroomed house (Para 55) – Refused Dismissed at Appeal 2019/2381 Erection of bungalow - Withdrawn
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.2ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Settlement extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	2 Bungalows
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:	Response
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		Potential access constraints existing hedge to site frontage. NCC Highways – Green, narrow carriageway, no footway.	Amber/green
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Primary School○ Secondary school○ Local healthcare services○ Retail services○ Local employment opportunities○ Peak-time public transport		No village Shop Bus stop within 80m and is on the bus route for Anglian 84 Primary School is within 973m	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Village Hall 1.36km Recreational ground/play area next to village hall 1.34km Public House 1.29km (A143) Pre-school at the primary school	Green
Utilities Capacity		Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure		Promoter advises water, no mains sewage and electricity available to site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability		The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues SNC Environmental Services Land Quality, Green: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No potentially contaminated sites are located within 500m of the site in question on the PCLR or Landmark databases. ○ Nothing of concern with regard to land quality noted on the historic OS maps Having regard to the size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk		<p>Surface Water Flooding 1-1000 to the southwest in the road and to the boundary to the west but not on the site</p> <p>LLFA - Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Rural River Valley and Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		<p>A5 – Waveney Rural River Valley – majority of the site falls into this character area</p> <p>B4 - Waveney Tributary Farmland – northern part of the site falls into this character area.</p>	
Overall Landscape Assessment		Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated. Sensitive landscape due to most of the site, particularly the frontage, being in the River Valley.	Amber
Townscape		The settlement is dispersed with different areas of character. This site is at the southern end of the village near the concentration of buildings at the junction of Low Road, Turnbeck Road and Station Road known as Piccadilly Corner. The site is currently used as paddock/agricultural and lies slightly to the east of the junction on the north side behind an existing hedge. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.	Amber/Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity		<p>Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Ecology – Green, potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment		<p>To the west of the site there are four listed buildings close to the plot: Gayridge Farmhouse C17 grade II, Three Ways (now Willow Cottage), a small C17/C18 thatched cottage, Picadilly House (west of Picadilly Corner) C17 timber frame cottage, and (former) C17 Brock's Farmhouse to the north west</p> <p>Development could therefore have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB located to the west but could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space		<p>Development of the site would result in the Millennium Garden Alburgh, Amenity Open Space designation (not been implemented)</p>	Amber
Transport and Roads		<p>Potential impact on functioning of the road network may not be reasonably mitigated. Narrow carriage way and no footway</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, narrow carriageway, no footway.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses		<p>Agricultural/residential</p> <p>SNC Environmental Services Amenity, Green: - No issues observed.</p>	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB' s.</p> <p>The site is detached from the main part of the village. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character, a feature of the River Valley. Therefore, the development would have a detrimental impact on townscape, which could not be reasonably mitigated.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints as there are existing hedge to site frontage.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock/agricultural grade 3	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow to the southern boundary. Residential boundaries to the west and east.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Removal of hedgerow which would be subject to an assessment of importance under the Hedgerows Regulations	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead line to the south (frontage of the site)	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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 limited due to existing residential development bounding the site to the west and east. Existing hedges screen the site from South. However, the development would be visible from the surrounding road network.	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not adjacent to the development boundary, detached from the main part of the village. Well related to some services. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character, a feature of the River Valley. Therefore, the development would have a detrimental impact on townscape and the landscape which could not be reasonably mitigated, particularly as most of the site is within the River Valley.	Amber/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 (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
A5 – Waveney Rural River Valley	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green
Open Countryside	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	N/A for two bungalows	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	Not applicable

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable due to potential adverse impacts on landscape, townscape and separation for the main part of the village.

Site Visit Observations

Detached from the main part of the village. Well related to some services. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character, a feature of the River Valley. Therefore, the development would have a detrimental impact on townscape and the landscape which could not be reasonably mitigated, particularly as most of the site is within the River Valley.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and river valley and not adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Unreasonable – The site is promoted for a Settlement Limit extension in a part of the village with no existing Settlement Limit. The character of the area is of mixed development (small scale industry, agriculture and residential), but very much dispersed in pattern. The site is at the edge of the designated River Valley and in the vicinity of four listed properties; whilst these in themselves might not prevent development, creating a Settlement Limit in this location could encourage development that would seriously erode the character of the area. Previous applications on this site for an outstanding county house (under the NPPF) and a sustainable (then Code 6) home have both been dismissed at appeal within the past 6 years.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 24/11/2020

SN5034

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5034
Site address	Land south of Beech Farm, Tunbeck Road, Alburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2016/6096 new dwelling refused. 2019/1690/O for 4 dwellings refused, appeal dismissed: outside development boundary, access to services and impact on landscape. 2019/0030/CUQ for COU to 2 dwellings refused; did not comply with part Q as a conversion.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.5
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12-13 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:	Response
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	Existing access; Highway Authority to advise - are visibility splays adequate for residential? NCC Highways – Amber. Access achievable with significant tree removal. Site remote, no walking/ cycling to catchment school. Substandard highway network.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Primary school and nursery; 900m. Bus stops to north of site; 200m. Also bus service in Wortwell but need to cross A143; 1.3km (Anglian 84 and 581). No shop. Microbrewery opposite with beer shop. No footpaths.	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	Village hall and sports facilities; 1.2km. Pub/restaurant on A143; 1.3km.	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	No known constraints. Environment Agency: Green re foul water capacity.	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Existing use is poultry sheds, may require some remediation. No known stability issues.	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1. Low surface water flood risk to south and medium surface water flood risk to east. Environment Agency: Green LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. At risk of surface water flooding but would not prevent development.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Rural River Valley.	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	A5 Waveney Rural River Valley. Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to Moderate (Green)	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Some rural development nearby originally associated with agriculture. Development loose and spread out. Proposed scale of residential would significantly alter this rural character. Site is flat, visible when approaching from south and will have some detrimental impact.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Outside development boundary and separate from main built-up area of village. Would be out of keeping with low key incremental rural development surrounding.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Low biodiversity potential due to intensive poultry units. Environment Agency: Green NCC Ecologist: Amber zone for great crested newts. Pond nearby. No priority habitats. Not in Green Infrastructure Corridor	Green
Historic Environment	Green	Grade II listed building to north. Impressive detached, thatched farmhouse with large separate barn. Set in large grounds within the rural area. Intense residential development adjacent would detract from its wider setting. HES - Amber	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Narrow rural road, 40mph. No footpaths and no safe walking route to school.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Access achievable with significant tree removal. Site remote, no walking / cycling to catchment school. Substandard highway network.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Paddock and detached house to north. Recent barn conversion to south-east.</p> <p>Agricultural use to east and south. Previous agricultural use to west now a microbrewery with associated shop and business uses (Iceni Kitchens).</p>	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Listed building to north, there is good separation and screening which will lessen any detrimental impact.</p> <p>Outside development boundary where there is only sporadic rural development and consolidating it with more intense residential development would have an impact within the river valley and on the rural character.</p>	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Is an existing access need to check with HA if visibility could be achieved.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural. Poultry sheds would need to be demolished.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential, agricultural and commercial. Likely to be compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat, no significant issues.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature hedges.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	<p>Mature trees and hedges to be considered around boundaries.</p> <p>Otherwise, it is in intense poultry use with grass and of low ecological value.</p>	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views into site from roadside because of hedgerow. Views as approach from south. No views from Station Road to north due to intervening hedging and trees.	N/A
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	<p>No existing development boundary and the site is detached from the main part of the village. There are services in the surrounding area, but all involve walking along narrow rural roads which are unlit and have no paths and there is no safe walking route to the school. Some are located across the A143 which is busy and not easy to cross.</p> <p>The character of the area is of mixed development (small scale industry, agriculture and residential), but very much dispersed in pattern. The site is at the edge of the designated River Valley and residential development in this location would erode the character of the area.</p>	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 (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Rural River Valley		N/A
Conclusion	Some negative impact	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	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate) Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Owner states agricultural use could cease immediately.	Amber
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Possible road widening needed – Highway Authority to advise.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated affordable housing will be provided in line with Policy.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is relatively unconstrained, although may require remediation work due to the current poultry units on site. However, the site is poorly related to the existing settlement and in townscape and landscape terms would mark a breakout in the open countryside, out of keeping with the low-key rural development in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the highways access is likely to require significant tree removal, making the site more prominent, and there are no safe foot and cycle connections to local facilities, particularly the catchment primary school, and the immediate network is substandard in terms of supporting new development.

Site Visit Observations

No existing development boundary and the site is detached from the main part of the village. There are services in the surrounding area, but all involve walking along narrow rural roads which are unlit and have no paths and there is no safe walking route to the school. Some are located across the A143 which is busy and not easy to cross.

The character of the area is of mixed development (small scale industry, agriculture and residential), but very much dispersed in pattern. The site is at the edge of the designated River Valley and residential development in this location would erode the character of the area.

Local Plan Designations

Some potential negative impact on the Rural River Valley (DM4.5)

Availability

Site owners indicate the agricultural use could cease with immediate effect; however, the site could require remediation work due to the current poultry units on site.

Achievability

The site itself appears achievable, although no supporting evidence has been submitted to demonstrate deliverability, including any potential off-site improvements (e.g. highways)

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is relatively unconstrained, although may require remediation work due to the current poultry units on site. Distance to services is acceptable, however some of these are separated from the site by the A143. The site is poorly related to the existing settlement and in townscape and landscape terms would mark a breakout in the open countryside, out of keeping with the low-key rural development in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the highways access is likely to require significant tree removal, making the site more prominent, and there are no safe foot and cycle connections to local facilities, particularly the catchment primary school, and the immediate network is substandard in terms of supporting new development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/22

SN5054SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5054SL
Site address	Land off Church Road, Alburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside Development Boundary
Planning History	2006/0407/O for a dwelling refused, appeal dismissed 19/12/2006.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.14Ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	None given. 4 dwellings @ 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:	Response
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	Existing gated access from Church Road would need to be up-graded. NCC Highways – Green. Wide verges and length of frontage would allow provision of visibility splays, albeit all frontage vegetation would need to be removed.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Primary School○ Secondary school○ Local healthcare services○ Retail services○ Local employment opportunities○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	No village Shop Bus stop 600m and is on the bus route for Anglian 84 Primary School 290m No footpaths	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	Village Hall 600m Recreational ground/play area next to village hall 600m Public House 2.30km (A143) Pre-school at the primary school	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	No known constraints	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, sewage and electricity available to site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1. Low surface water risk in south of site. LLFA - Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a significant detrimental impact on the undeveloped landscape in this location which cannot be reasonably mitigated.	Red
Townscape	Red	The site is not adjacent to the development boundary and not related to any group of dwellings or buildings. It would be completely out of character with the built form of the village.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No designations. Mature trees and hedges, potential for habitat. NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ but residential and water discharge do not need NE consultation. Amber risk zone for GCN and ponds within 250m of the site. No priority habitats onsite and not in GI corridor. No PROW.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby listed All Saints Church Grade I and War memorial Grade II, located to the north. Views of the church tower. Site of Archaeological Interest opposite – this site would also need investigation. HES – Amber. Close to possible deserted village	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on functioning of Church Road/road network may not be reasonably mitigated. Narrow carriage way and no footway.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Whilst the site is within reasonable walking distance from the primary school, A safe off-carriageway walking route is not available, it is also remote from other local services. The surrounding highway network substandard e.g. narrow and no footways.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural – compatible.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Technical officer to assess impact on setting of listed church which is prominent. This part of the village is characterised by open space and mature trees and it would be out of character with the townscape.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing small field access which would need to be upgraded. The road is narrow with no footpaths.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield, no buildings.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Grassland	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	No significant change in level.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature trees and hedges.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in and around the site as is undeveloped with mature vegetation and hedgerow links.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	None evident and unlikely to be contaminated.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views limited into and out of the site, medium views but no longer views in the landscape.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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 not adjacent to the development boundary and would be separate from existing development. It would significantly alter the character of Church Road to the detriment of the setting of the attractive listed church. The road network is poor with no footpaths or lit routes to services although services are relatively close.	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 (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
None		N/A
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None supplied	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Site is under threshold for these.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter is suggesting affordable housing, the site is under threshold to require this.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is not well related to the existing built form of the village and would represent an isolated dwelling in the countryside, with consequent negative townscape and landscape impacts. The site also has heritage concerns regarding nearby listed buildings and potential archaeological interest. Whilst site access should be achievable, this would result in the loss of hedgerow, and the local road network is narrow carriageways with no footway provision.

Site Visit Observations

The site is not adjacent to the development boundary and would be separate from existing development. It would significantly alter the character of Church Road to the detriment of the setting of the attractive listed church. The road network is poor with no footpaths or lit routes to services although services are relatively close.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability.

The site promoter indicates the site is available.

Achievability

The site promoter indicates the site is achievable, but no supporting evidence has been submitted to support this e.g. in terms of delivering a suitable access, potential archaeological investigation etc.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site would represent an isolated dwelling (small group of dwellings) in the countryside, with consequent landscape and townscape issues. The site would impact on the setting of the nearby listed church, and also potentially on a site of archaeological interest. Whilst the site is relatively close to local facilities, creating an access would impact on the rural character of Church Road, and the local network is narrow, unlit with no footways.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/22

SN5055SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5055SL
Site address	Site opposite village hall, Low Road, Alburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside Development Boundary
Planning History	1986/2106/O for three dwellings refused, appeal dismissed 25/8/87
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.37Ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Not stated. 9 @ 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:	Response
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	There is a road frontage onto Low Road and visibility is good in both directions. NCC Highways – Green. Wide verges and length of frontage would allow visibility splays, albeit all frontage vegetation would need to be removed.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Primary School○ Secondary school○ Local healthcare services○ Retail services○ Local employment opportunities○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	No village Shop Bus stop adjacent and is on the bus route for Anglian 84 Primary School is 290m No footpaths	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	Village Hall opposite Recreational ground/play area next to village hall opposite Public House 2.20km (A143) Pre-school at the primary school	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Promoter advises water, sewage and electricity available to site.	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability		The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1. Low surface water risk from pond adjacent to west. LLFA - Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage. The on-site minor flooding in the 0.1% AEP event is minor ponding concentrated to the site boundary and associated with a pond feature bordering the site.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a significant detrimental impact on the undeveloped landscape in this location which cannot be reasonably mitigated.	Red
Townscape	Amber	A concentrated development of houses on this site would be out of character with this verdant part of Low Road which adds significantly to the character of the village. There is a break in the development boundary to the north and so this site would not be a continuation of that boundary.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No designations. Mature trees and pond adjacent, also buildings to rear with potential habitat – would require investigation. NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ but residential and water discharge do not need NE consultation. Amber risk zone for GCN and pond adjacent and within 250m of the site. No priority habitats onsite and not in GI corridor. No PROW.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Two Listed Buildings to south-west with access along south boundary of the site also, Tudor House to the north-west means the site would impact on the wider setting of all three. These have all been omitted from the development boundary to protect this. HES - Amber	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>The road network is inadequate with no footpath or lit routes; however the site is relatively close to services.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. The site is located on bus route, but there is no walking rote to catchment primary school.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Garden/grassland to south and west with large residential properties. Opposite village hall. Compatible.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	This side of the road is characterised by large, detached properties set well back from the road with significant green frontages. Three of the properties are listed, including those directly behind the site which have been excluded from the development boundary. A concentration of dwellings here would be out of character and have a negative impact on the setting of the listed buildings.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Appears that this is achievable, would need Highway Authority advice.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Grassland, no buildings.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential, compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level and flat	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature hedges and trees	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	As above, with a pond to the rear, all providing habitats which would require investigation.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Electricity poles crossing the site to the village hall. No evidence of contamination.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Currently limited because of vegetation. No long views into or out of the site.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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 well located in terms of services, but development of this site would have a significant impact on the verdant landscape along the west side of Low Road. It would also impact on the setting of the adjacent listed buildings.	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 (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
None		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is relatively well located in terms of distance to local services; however, the local network is narrow, unlit with no footways. The site itself is opposite the village hall, however the west of Low Road is characterised by large, detached dwellings, generally set back from the frontage; as such development of this site would be out of keeping. There are also a number of listed buildings in the vicinity.

Site Visit Observations

The site is well located in terms of services, but development of this site would have a significant impact on the verdant landscape along the west side of Low Road. It would also impact on the setting of the adjacent listed buildings.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability

The site promoter indicates the site is available.

Achievability

The site promoter indicates the site is deliverable, however no supporting evidence has been submitted to support this.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is well located in relation to the local services, however the creating of an access would significantly change the verdant character of the west side of Low Road and the local network is narrow, unlit and has no footways. West of Low Road is characterised by large, detached dwellings, generally set back from the frontage; as such development of this site would be out of keeping. There are also a number of listed buildings in the vicinity.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022