



# Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

## Site Assessments

### Alpington, Yelverton and Bergh Apton

## Contents

SN0122SL .....	3
SN0203 .....	12
SN0210 .....	21
SN0400 .....	30
SN0412 .....	40
SN0433 .....	49
SN0433REV.....	60
SN0434 .....	72
SN0435 .....	82
SN0529SL .....	91
SN0533 .....	102
SN1012 .....	111
SN2006 .....	121
SN2015 .....	131
SN2022 .....	139
SN2023 .....	148
SN2117 .....	156
SN4030 .....	165
SN5002 .....	173
SN5038 .....	183

## SN0122SL

### Part 1 Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0122SL
Site address	Land to the north of Cooke's Road, Bergh Apton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside of development boundary
Planning History	Recent refusals of planning application for residential development upheld at appeal (most recent ref: 2018/0758)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.32 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Settlement limit extension for six dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	18dph
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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Site frontage on Cookes Road; previous appeal decision dismissed the appeal partly on highway safety grounds</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> – Red. Road is narrow, with no footways/verges, may be difficult to achieve safe access to the site. Poor visibility at the Cookes Rd junction with The Street. Allocated site opposite the village hall was contrary to highways opinion and hasn't made any contribution to improving the local highway network.</p>	Red

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"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Alpington &amp; Bergh Apton school is 1.5 km with no footways</p> <p>Farm shop with post office is 2km away with no footways</p> <p>Bus service is 1.2 metres away</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Bergh Apton village hall is 60 metres away with no footways</p> <p>The Wheel of Fortune PH in Alpington is 1.8 km away with no footways until you get the settlement of Alpington</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would be relatively contained by trees from wider landscape but would be visible from Cookes Road and would have an urbanising effect.	Red
Townscape	Amber	The north side of Cookes Road is relatively undeveloped and therefore development of this site has the potential to adversely affect the character of the area	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any impact should be able to be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Site adjacent to listed Washingford Barn but given screening is unlikely to affect setting  HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Unlikely to have significant impact if safe access can be achieved</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - Road is narrow, with no footways/verges, may be difficult to achieve safe access to the site. Poor visibility at the Cookes Rd junction with The Street. Allocated site opposite the village hall was contrary to highways opinion and hasn't made any contribution to improving the local highway network.</p>	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?	The north side of Cookes Road is relatively undeveloped. As a consequence, development of this alone would appear incongruous and would be detrimental to the form and character of the settlement	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Appeal dismissed on these grounds and it would appear these constraints remain. Some evidence has been submitted which would need to be considered by the Highway Authority.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	No demolition issues	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; no compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Woodland to east of site; less dense trees and vegetation on other boundaries; hedgerow on highway boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Pond within site and on adjoining land although pond on site does dry out in summer plus trees and hedgerow	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)	Greenfield – unlikely to be contaminated	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site visible from road but screened from other views	Not applicable



Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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 should only be considered if the decision is taken to allocate the adjacent site. If this decision is not taken the development boundary should remain in its current position	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)
Historic Parkland	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Amber
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Amber

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

The site is adjacent to the existing settlement limit, but it extends to the north of Cookes Road where development is more sporadic. It is remote from the main part of the settlement and the road network is limited. There are concerns relating to trees and hedgerow loss.

### Site Visit Observations

The site is a largely undeveloped side of Cookes Road where development of this alone would appear incongruous.

### Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside but adjacent to the development boundary.

### Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

### Achievability

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

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is **UNREASONABLE** for development given the location separated from the main part of the settlement where the surrounding highway network is substandard with no safe walking route to the school; a 2019 appeal decision concluded that two dwellings on this site would have an *'unacceptably harmful effect on highway safety'*. Whilst it is adjacent to the settlement limit there would be an impact on the landscape as it would extend into countryside to the north of Cooke's Road and the character is of limited development; the 2019 appeal decision highlighted this site would *'cause material harm to the area's open and rural appearance'*. It would also have an impact on the nearby heritage assets including the historic parkland setting of Bergh Apton Manor, and nearby listed properties.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 22 June 2020

## SN0203

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0203
Site address	Land to the south of Church Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Historic refused applications for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation – up to 25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>HEELA states that initial highway evidence has indicated that potential highway constraints could be overcome but that the local road network is unsuitable</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - Church Road is very narrow and NCC would not support a greenfield site in this location.</p>	Amber

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"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Alpington &amp; Bergh Apton school is 2.2 km with no footways</p> <p>Farm shop with post office is 2.6 km away with no footways</p> <p>Bus service is 600 metres away</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Bergh Apton village hall is 850 metres away with no footways</p> <p>The Wheel of Fortune PH in Alpington is 2.5 km away with no footways until you get the settlement of Alpington</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green	AW advise sewers crossing the site	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that site has mains water supply and electricity	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	HEELA raises possible concern about concrete crushing site nearby; however this has been also been put forward as a possible redevelopment site.	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Would have an impact on the character of the landscape but with some mitigation possible given adjoining development.</p> <p><b>SNC Landscape Meeting</b> - Roadside hedge subject to Hedgerows Regulations; would need to have more information to test against DM4.8. Mature oaks in the adjacent garden would also be a constraint. Does not appear to be incompatible with LCA</p>	Amber
Townscape	Green	<p>Relates to existing residential development to the east and infills with existing development to the west.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> – Amber, this is generally considered the best Tayler &amp; Green grouping in the district because of the way it shapes around landscaping/green, and a good design would be expected of the adjacent site.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impact should be able to be mitigated	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Adjacent listed Taylor &amp; Green properties.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> – Amber, impact on setting of listed Tayler &amp; Green properties but this can be taken into account in design approach so amber.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Narrow country lane is a constraint. Some improvements may be required</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - Church Road is very narrow and NCC would not support a greenfield site in this location.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green



#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site has the potential to affect the setting of listed buildings. However these listed buildings are 20 <sup>th</sup> century housing which development of the site could relate to – will need heritage advice	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	If highway authority are satisfied with standard of Church Road to accommodate development of the site then yes but would need removal of section of hedgerow	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to south and on opposite side of road to north. Residential to east and west. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge on highway with some veteran trees and southern boundaries. Hedge and trees on western boundary and hedging on eastern boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Yes, significant trees and hedges on most boundaries. No ponds on site or in immediate vicinity	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 likelihood of contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site over hedge from Church Road. Possible longer distance views from south	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is adjacent to existing dwellings which although listed new development could potentially relate to. Accessed by narrow country lane with hedge and veteran trees on the highway boundary. Lack of connectivity to local facilities.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Improvements to Church Road could be required; clarification from Highway Authority required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Acknowledges affordable housing requirement but no evidence of viability submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Suitable size to be allocated and would fit broadly with the 'clustered' character of Bergh Apton; however, the site is immediately adjacent a group of listed Tayler and Green properties, and is accessed via a narrow stretch of Church Road. Loss of frontage trees/hedgerow would also be an issue.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is adjacent to existing dwellings which although listed new development could potentially relate to. Accessed by narrow country lane with hedge and veteran trees on the highway boundary. Lack of connectivity to local facilities.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within open countryside removed from development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Unreasonable** – whilst the site would broadly fit with the 'clustered' nature of Bergh Apton, it is adjacent to a significant grouping of listed Tayler and Green properties. Church Road itself is narrow, with no footways; whilst the nearby brownfield site can offset the traffic generated by new dwellings against the previous use of the site, the same cannot be said of a greenfield site. Loss of the frontage hedge would also erode the character of the area, and the site would be further constrained by the need to protect the mature oak trees on the boundary of the property to the west.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 23 June 2020

## SN0210

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0210
Site address	Church Wood, Welbeck Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Erection of animal shelter on site in 1990s
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.26 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Settlement limit change to accommodate a contemporary residential building
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	(n/a as only promoting for a single dwelling)
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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Levels and constraints of local road network may make access to site difficult to achieve.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school	Amber

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"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Alpington &amp; Bergh Apton school is 3.2 km with no footways, however Thurton Primary School is 2.6 km away (also no footway provision)</p> <p>Farm shop with post office in Bergh Apton is 3.5 km metres away with no footways, whilst shop and post office in Brooke is slightly closer at 3.2km</p> <p>Bus service passes site</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Bergh Apton village hall is 1.6km away with no footways</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter notes Mains water, sewerage and electricity supply available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		No information currently available	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	<p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated</p> <p><b>NCC Minerals &amp; Waste</b> - sites over 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Small areas of identified surface water risk, however the site is of sufficient size that it could easily accommodate one dwelling without this being an issue	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> )		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Potential impact on wider landscape due to sloping site down into valley	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Poor relation to existing development	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Adjoins SSSI and CWS	Amber



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II* listed church to east. Potential adverse setting on site setting though may be able to be mitigated depending on scale and precise siting of development  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Narrow rural lanes may need some localised improvements  <b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Potential compatibility issues with the adjoining depot would need to be considered	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Adjacent to church so has potential to impact on it's setting depending which part of the site was developed, removed from any part of the settlement	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potentially difficult to achieve due to narrow road, gradient, junction and bend.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Mainly wooded, with some agricultural use in lower part of site	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Church to east, agricultural to north and south, depot to west	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Falls from north to south	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site is wooded	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site is adjacent to County Wildlife Site as well as likely to provide plenty of habitat itself due to its wooded nature	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)	Greenfield – unlikely to be contaminated	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is on side of slope so potential to be quite prominent from Welbeck valley. Public right of way also bisects the site.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site not suitable for development. It is well removed from any development boundary, however even if it were close or adjoining the development boundary there would be significant concerns in terms of character, access and ecology.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Suitable size to be allocated, and is opposite a County Council recycling centre. However, there are numerous constraints to this site. It is remote from the Bergh Apton, with poor connectivity to the services there and in surrounding villages. The local road network is not considered suitable for additional traffic from development. The site is an attractive, partially wooded site in the Wellbeck valley, bisected by a public right of way. Development is likely to be at least in part further constrained by the adjoining County Wildlife Site and the impact it could have on the setting of the Grade II\* Listed Church.

### **Site Visit Observations**

This site is wooded and on a valley slope. It is remote from the village and accessed down rural lanes. It is also adjacent to a Grade II\* listed church and protected wildlife sites.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within open countryside and remote from development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Unreasonable** – although the site is situated opposite a County Council recycling centre, it is not considered that further development in this location would be acceptable. The site is remote from services/facilities in Bergh Apton and other settlements, with a poor highways network the already supports the recycling centre traffic. The site forms an attractive, partially wooded, section of the Well Beck/Chet Valley, bisected by a public right of way. The site is also immediately adjacent to a County Wildlife Site and the Grade II\* Listed St Peter & St Paul's Church.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 23 June 2020

## SN0400

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0400
Site address	Land at Church Meadow, Alington
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	2014/2460 - 21 dwellings EIA not required. 2014/2608 - 21 dwellings, refused. Reasonable alternative at last Local Plan.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.87ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocated site for up to 22 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted at 11.8/ha
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access from Church Meadow, which appears to be the same width as the existing road and footways.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, footway access to school, good standard junction at Church Meadow/Church Road. Carriageway widening to 5.5m required in vicinity of junction with Church Road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - Church Meadow access is sufficient/ satisfactory. Existing footway to the school with a good junction at Church Road. Public comments refer to need for widening of Church Road and additional crossing point. As development is of a similar scale to that previously proposed these details are required; key issue would be road widening on Church Road by the Church Meadow junction; potentially formalize existing unmarked bus stops; crossing point to the village hall, but this would not need to be a substantial.</p>	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"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Primary School - 500m</p> <p>Bus stop on X2 route (Slade Rd) - 1,600m</p> <p>Aldis &amp; Sons Farm Shop - 1,800m</p> <p>Variety of small-scale local employment in the vicinity.</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Village Hall with Recreation Ground - 250m</p> <p>Yelverton Football Club &amp; Pavilion - 550m</p> <p>Pub - 800m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific know constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified on/close to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for NR14 7NY area.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			Green



Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>Greenfield site with no known issues.</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services</b> – Green.</p> <p>Land Quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potentially contaminated sites are located within 500m of the site in question on the PCLR or Landmark databases other than a former agricultural repair workshop (about 450m from the site in question) and a graveyard. Neither of these are considered significant.</li> <li>- Nothing of concern with regard to land quality noted on the historic OS maps.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	<p>1:1000 year surface water flooding in the centre/southern end of the site.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> - Few or no constraints.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	<p>Part Tributary Farmland</p> <p>Part Settled Plateau Farmland</p>	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Majority of site is Settled Plateau Farmland, with small area to the south in Tributary Farmland.	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>No designated landscapes, but veteran tree in the northeast corner.</p> <p>Well contained site, with mature trees and hedging to the north and west.</p> <p>Grade 3 Agricultural Land.</p> <p><a href="#">SNC Landscape Meeting</a> – Acceptable, visually contained site, no landscape objections to previous application 2014/2608. Any development would need to improve situation for veteran tree, and retain boundary vegetation.</p>	Green
Townscape	Green	<p>Well contained site with modern (late C20) housing development to the south and east.</p> <p><a href="#">SNC Heritage &amp; Design</a> – Green</p>	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designated sites within close proximity. However some mature hedgerow/tress on the boundary, which are likely to require protection.</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>St Mary's Church, Yelverton to the north east of the site, although existing houses and sports pavilion are between the church and this site. No obvious inter-visibility.</p> <p><a href="#">SNC Heritage &amp; Design</a> – Green, no real impact on setting of church because of existing development to the east.</p> <p><a href="#">HES</a> - Amber</p>	<a href="#">Green</a>
Open Space	Green	<p>Not within an identified open space, although there would appear to be informal paths across the north west of the site.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Requires access through existing residential development, but otherwise links to the current network serving the village, which links to the A146 and Poringland.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Green, footway access to school, good standard junction at Church Meadow/Church Road. Carriageway widening to 5.5m required in vicinity of junction with Church Road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - Church Meadow access is sufficient/ satisfactory. Existing footway to the school with a good junction at Church Road.</p>	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Medium/low density housing to the south and east. Sports field to the north. Agricultural to the west.</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services</b> – Green.</p> <p>Amenity: - No issues observed.</p>	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Well contained site, which could be developed at a similar density to the adjoining Church Meadow development.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Road width access from Church Meadow	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield, although parts of the field appear to have been fenced off for domestic use and to keep horses/ponies.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to the south and east, football club to the north, agricultural to the west. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature hedgerows with trees to the north and west, domestic boundaries to the south and east.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some mature trees within the hedgerows on the boundary/just outside of the site. Veteran in the north east corner.	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)	Greenfield, therefore 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	Public views are limited, principally from the main access point.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Well contained site, with limited features within the site itself, but mature hedgerows to the north and west boundaries. Would appear suitable for similar scale/density development to the adjoining Church Meadow housing.	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 (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Adjoining the Development Boundary	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Not currently being market, is being promoted on behalf of Ottley Properties.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	
Comments:	Site was vacant at the time of promotion, but appears to have some domestic use at present.	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Evidence has been supplied, including an updated layout for the site, however much of this dates from the original 2016 submission.  Site being promoted on behalf of an established house builder.  No known constraints to delivery.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Large site, capable of accommodating open space. It is not envisaged that any off site improvements will be required.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes, at the time of submission in 2016	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Potentially an enhanced level of open space, given the size/shape of the site and the ability to accommodate 25 dwellings.	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

No overriding constraints and site is reasonably located to access local services/facilities with good standards roads and footway links. Greenfield site, adjacent to the existing development boundary.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Well contained site, which could be developed at a similar density to the adjoining development. Protection of the veteran tree and the mature landscaping to the existing boundaries is required.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside, but adjacent to the existing Development Boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states that the site is available, viable and in the ownership of a developer.

### **Achievability**

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Reasonable – the site is well located in terms of access to local services/facilities, with footway links to those in the village. The site is visually well contained, with no overriding constraints. Suitable for allocation for up to 25 dwellings, reflecting the scale and density of Church Meadow and the constraints of the site shape. Opportunity to enhance the setting the veteran tree in the north east corner of the site.

**Preferred Site:** Yes

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 05/11/20

## SN0412

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0412
Site address	Former concrete works, Church Road, Bergh Apton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.7 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation of 12-25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Brownfield

### 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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential access constraints could be overcome through development</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - Reasonable to support a brownfield site with previous associated traffic movements. The site would probably be best developed with a less formal layout/highways infrastructure, emphasising it's rural location. Shouldn't result in higher traffic numbers than previous use of the site (recognising that this will have included a high proportion of HGVs); minimum is road widening and footpath along site frontage but ideally as far as the St/Church Rd junction to the east. However, there</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		may be limitations due to third party land constraints - so an alternative would be to provide passing places ("localised improvements to Church Road"). The policy for this site should be prescriptive to ensure no upwards creep of numbers on site beyond what has been accepted by HA.	
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Alpington &amp; Bergh Apton school is 2.1 km with no footways</p> <p>Farm shop with post office is 2.4km away with no footways</p> <p>Bus service is 300 metres away</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Bergh Apton village hall is 1.1km away with no footways</p> <p>The Wheel of Fortune PH in Alpington is 2.5 km away with no footways until you get the settlement of Alpington</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewerage infrastructure upgrades and off-site mains reinforcement may be required	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	The site promoter has stated that mains water supply and electricity are available on the site. Sewerage is not	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Site is likely to be contaminated to some extent but should be able to be mitigated	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Some identified surface water flood risk on site but can be mitigated  LLFA - Few or no constraints.	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
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is currently detrimental to local landscape, but is quite open and visible so new development would need to be sensitively designed with mitigation through landscaping  SNC Landscape Meeting - does not appear to be incompatible with LCA, subject to appropriate scheme design. Opportunity to enhance views to the north from the nearby PRow. Existing vegetation does not appear to be historic and is a non-native mix.	Green
Townscape	Green	Adjacent to one dwelling but otherwise removed from the settlement  SNC Heritage & Design – Green	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>Unlikely to have an adverse impact given existing use on site. Potential for enhancement</p> <p><b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No identified heritage asset affected by development</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> – Green</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Narrow country lane may need improvements</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - Reasonable to support a brownfield site with previous associated traffic movements. The site would probably be best developed with a less formal layout/highways infrastructure, emphasising it's rural location.</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?	Site relates poorly to existing settlement but may be some potential to link site to existing cluster of development at junction of corner of The Street and Church Road through development of site SN0203. Alternatively it could be another small standalone cluster of development as is characteristic of the settlement. No adverse impact on historic environment	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Need to consult with highway authority further. Existing access into site but Church Road is rural and narrow and if highway authority seek improvements could result in loss of hedgerows and trees	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Brownfield use with structures on site that will increase development costs. However, benefits from removing these derelict structures	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Mainly agricultural with one dwelling to east so no compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is relatively level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows and some trees on boundary	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some habitat possible in boundaries	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)	Some potential for contamination on site	N/A

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 available into site from Church Road. Relatively contained from other directions by planting, although some views possible from Lower Kiln Lane to west	N/A
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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 a brownfield site there benefits from redevelopment of this site. It is separated from the other parts of the settlement along a narrow country lane, although this is common for most parts of Bergh Apton.	

#### 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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately/Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		N/A

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Whilst the site is not ideally located on a narrow country lane, there is a long-standing historic traffic use which can be offset against the traffic from new housing. As well as the removal of existing industrial/storage building on site, the development would be broadly in keeping with the character of Bergh Apton as cluster groups of dwellings, rather than infill the gaps between the clusters. Existing vegetation around the site is relatively recent and non-native.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Brownfield site separated from the other parts of the settlement along a narrow country lane, although this is common for most parts of Bergh Apton.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside and removed from development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Reasonable – whilst the site is not ideal in terms of highways access, the traffic generated by former uses (and potential lawful uses of the site) can be offset against the traffic from any redevelopment. Consideration needs to be given to the level of highways works that would be appropriate in this rural setting. The site could be seen as compatible with the pattern of small clustered groups of dwellings that make up Bergh Apton, and preferable to further infilling between the clusters. The site itself has few constraints other than the clearance and clean-up costs related to the current buildings, hardstanding etc. Existing vegetation is non-native and redevelopment offers an opportunity to enhance the site.

### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 23/06/2020



SN0433

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0433
Site address	Land at Wheel Road, Alington NR14 7NL
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	No planning applications post-2000 Reasonable alternative in the last Local Plan
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.0
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocated site.  (Promoted for approximately 10 dwellings as a SL extension)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Minimum of 12/ha.  (Promoted for 10/ha)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	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	<p>Long frontage to Wheel Road, with existing field access.</p> <p><a href="#">NCC Highways Meeting</a> - From a Highways perspective the entire frontage needs improvement; could widen Wheel Road, however this would require substantial hedge removal. Wheel Road narrows outside the Wheel of Fortune, but this relatively short pinch point should be OK. Reeders Lane junction is substandard – could potentially be widened for improved visibility.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Primary School - 450m</p> <p>Aldis &amp; Son Farm Shop - 1,175m</p> <p>Various small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity.</p>	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Pub - less than 50m Village Hall with Recreation Ground - 775m Yelverton Football Club & Pavilion - 950m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	33Kv overhead lines at the eastern end of the site, may require diversion/effect the layout of development.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for NR14 7NL area.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Greenfield site with no known issues. <b>SNC Env Services:</b> Green Land Quality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potentially contaminated sites are located within 500m of the site in question on the PCLR or Landmark databases other than a former agricultural repair workshop (about 120m from the site in question) and a graveyard. Neither of these are considered significant.</li> <li>- Nothing of concern with regard to land quality noted on the historic OS maps.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	Small area in the east of the site subject to surface water flooding up to 1 in 100 years.  LLFA - Few or no constraints.	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
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	No designated landscapes.  Substantial hedge to the road frontage, with mature tree at the Wheel Rd/Reeder's Lane junction. However, hedging likely to be lost to create a suitable access. Aspect to the south is more open and visible from south on Reeder's Lane.  Grade 3 agricultural land.  SNC Landscape Meeting - Significant boundary/roadside hedgerow and vegetation. Does not appear to be compatible with LCA.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Postwar housing on the opposite side of Wheel Road, and Wheel of Fortune pub immediately to the east. However this site would extend the settlement into more open countryside south of the village. Potential to screen/integrate the site.  SNC Heritage & Design – Amber	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designated sites within close proximity. However some mature hedgerow/tress on the boundary, which are likely to require protection.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Red	<p>Potential impact on listed building to the south, Stacey Cottage, which currently has no screening between it and the site.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> – Amber, a suitably designed linear development would be fine, if developed to the north along the same line as the FW properties site to the east, this would leave a suitably sized rectangular agricultural field to the south. There is also the Wheel of Fortune to consider as a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space.	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Assuming a suitable access can be achieved the site links to the current network serving the village, which links to the A146 and Poringland.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - From a Highways perspective the entire frontage needs improvement; could widen Wheel Road, however this would require substantial hedge removal. Wheel Road narrows outside the Wheel of Fortune, but this relatively short pinch point should be OK. Reeders Lane junction is substandard – could potentially be widened for improved visibility.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Pub to the east, road frontage to the north and west, with residential development beyond. Agricultural land to the south.</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services:</b> Green</p> <p>Amenity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The site in question is adjacent to the Wheel of Fortune PH, Wheel Road, Alington, Norfolk, NR14 7NL. Consideration should be given to the potential impact of the Public House on future residents along with the impact on the future viability of the Public House of introducing noise sensitive receptors close to it.</li> </ul>	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Potential impact on the listed Stacey Cottage to the south.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Current field entrance to the site, close to the existing junction with Fortune Green. Substantial hedge, at least part of which may need to be removed. On a bend in Wheel Road and extends to the junction with Reeder's Lane.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, with no obvious concerns.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Pub, residential and open countryside. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Road frontage to Wheel Road and Reeder's Lane, only immediately adjoining development is the pub.  Currently no boundary to the south, as the site subdivides a larger field.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Substantial hedgerow, with a ditch, to the Wheel Road frontage, includes tree(s) at the Reeder's Lane junction.	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)	Two sets of overhead powerlines across the site, which may require diversion or accomodating in any development layout.	N/A

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 of the site from the village are limited by the existing hedge, although any removal to create an access would make the site significantly more open. The site is more open from the south and can be seen through the field entrance on Reeder's Lane.	N/A
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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>Whilst the site is effectively in gap between the Wheel of Fortune pub and housing on Burgate Lane, with additional housing on the opposite side of Wheel Road, the site has a rural feel, with a substantial hedge and ditch to the Wheel Road frontage and a more open aspect to the south.</p> <p>Careful consideration needs to be given to any access, with the bend in Wheel Road and junctions with Reeder's Lane and Fortune Green, plus the potential need to remove at least part of the frontage hedge.</p>	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		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>		Green



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Not currently being marketed, but is promoted by a house builder.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	
Comments:		Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Site promoted by an established house builder who also completed the nearby 2015 allocation on Wheel Road. No known constraints to delivery.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Landowner also controls and to the south, should open space/landscaping etc be required. It is not envisaged that further off-site improvements will be required.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes, at the time of submission in 2016	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is an unconstrained greenfield site, relatively well located in terms of access to local services/facilities. Keeping the development to the northern part of the field would limit the impact on the rural setting of Stace Cottage to the south. However, Wheel Road at the site frontage is narrow and has restricted forward visibility and the carriageway narrows in vicinity of the Wheel of Fortune PH. Whilst this 'pinch point' at the pub might be acceptable, the removal of the substantial frontage hedge (containing some larger trees) would significantly change the character of the area. Need to establish whether the 33Kv power lines are a constraint.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site quite rural in character, and currently well screened from surrounding development. However that screening is likely to need to be removed to access the site.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside, but on the opposite side of Wheel Road to the existing Development Boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter is a local house builder who states that the site is available and viable.

### **Achievability**

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is reasonably located in terms of local services and facilities and has few on-site constraints. The main concerns with the site relate to the removal of the substantial frontage hedge (with trees) to facilitate the necessary highways improvements, across the whole site frontage from the Reeder's Lane/Burgate Lane junction (which itself would require improvement) to the Wheel of Fortune. This would significantly change the character of the area and raise concerns in terms of wider landscape character.

### **UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR FOCUSED REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION:**

Development on this site would reflect the existing build form seen along Wheel Road. Hedgerow removal has been identified as being necessary for an acceptable highways scheme to come forward, which could expose the site to the landscape. However, replacement planting would assist in reducing the overall impact on the landscape. Planting along the southern border of the site would also reduce the impact on the landscape. Considering the mitigation measures that have been identified, the Council considers the site appropriate for allocation for approximately 12 dwellings.

### **UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR REGULATION 19 ADDENDUM:**

The site is relatively unconstrained and located close to local facilities. However, during the Focused Regulation 18 Consultation, concerns were raised regarding the loss of the hedgerow along the site frontage that would be necessary to accommodate the highways scheme to make the site

acceptable. Following review of the representations received, it was determined that the harm resulting from this would outweigh the benefits of developing the site for the number of dwellings proposed, given the availability of alternatives and that there are already 50 dwellings allocated over two sites in this Cluster. The site has therefore not been taken forward at this time.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 5 November 2020

## SN0433REV

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0433REV
Site address	Land at Wheel Road, Alington NR14 7NL
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	No planning applications post-2000  Northern part of the site was a reasonable alternative in the last Local Plan site assessments
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.3ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocated site.
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25 dwellings at 7.6 dwellings/ha.
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	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	<p>Long frontage to Wheel Road, with existing field access.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, not acceptable due to highway network constraints - Reeders Lane appears very narrow. Vis to west from Reeders La to Burgate La, not to sufficient standard and without scope for improvement within highway. Wheel Road at the site frontage is narrow and has restricted forward visibility. The carriageway narrows in vicinity of the Wheel of Fortune PH where there does not appear to be sufficient highway to provide 5.5m c/w and 2m f/w. The highway could be improved over the length of the site frontage but not to the east.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - From a Highways perspective the entire frontage needs improvement; could widen Wheel Road, however this would require substantial hedge removal. Wheel Road narrows outside the Wheel of Fortune, but this relatively short pinch point should be OK. Reeders Lane junction is substandard – could potentially be widened for improved visibility.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Primary School - 450m</p> <p>Aldis Farm Shop – 1,175m</p> <p>Various small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity.</p>	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Pub - less than 50m Village Hall with Recreation Ground - 775m Yelverton Football Club & Pavilion - 950m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific know constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.  AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	33Kv overhead lines at the eastern end of the site, may require diversion/effect the layout of development.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for NR14 7NL area.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Greenfield site with no known issues.  <b>SNC Env Services:</b> Green Land Quality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potentially contaminated sites are located within 500m of the site in question on the PCLR or Landmark databases other than a former agricultural repair workshop (about 120m from the site in question) and a graveyard. Neither of these are considered significant.</li> <li>- Nothing of concern with regard to land quality noted on the historic OS maps.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	Small areas along the eastern edge of the site subject to surface water flooding (up to 1 in 30 years).  LLFA - Few or no constraints.	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> )		Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	No designated landscapes.  Substantial hedge to the road frontage, with mature tree at the Wheel Rd/Reeder's Lane junction. However, hedging likely to be lost to create a suitable access. Aspect to the south is more open and visible from south on Reeder's Lane.  Grade 3 agricultural land.  SNC Landscape Meeting - Significant boundary/roadside hedgerow and vegetation. Does not appear to be compatible with LCA.	
Townscape	Green	Postwar housing on the opposite side of Wheel Road, and Wheel of Fortune pub immediately to the east. However this site would extend the settlement into more open countryside south of the village. Potential to screen/integrate the site.	



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designated sites within close proximity. However some mature hedgerow/tress on the boundary, which are likely to require protection.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain</p>	
Historic Environment	Red	<p>Likely impact on listed building to the south, Stacey Cottage, which currently has no screening between it and the site. Larger site would inevitably encroach more on the setting.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> – Red, estate like development which would result from this site being development would certainly be more detrimental to Stacey's Cottage to the south west. There is also the Wheel of Fortune to consider as a non-designated heritage asset in relation to NPPF para 197.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space.	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Assuming a suitable access can be achieved the site links to the current network serving the village, which links to the A146 and Poringland.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, not acceptable due to highway network constraints - Reeders Lane appears very narrow. Vis to west from Reeders La to Burgate La, not to sufficient standard and without scope for improvement within highway. Wheel Road at the site frontage is narrow and has restricted forward visibility. The carriageway narrows in vicinity of the Wheel of Fortune PH where there does not appear to be sufficient highway to provide 5.5m c/w and 2m f/w. The highway could be improved over the length of the site frontage but not to the east.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - From a Highways perspective the entire frontage needs improvement; could widen Wheel Road, however this would require substantial hedge removal. Wheel Road narrows outside the Wheel of Fortune, but this relatively short pinch point should be OK. Reeders Lane junction is substandard – could potentially be widened for improved visibility.</p>	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Pub to the east, road frontage to the north and west, with residential development beyond. Agricultural land to the south.</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services:</b> Green</p> <p>Amenity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The site in question is adjacent to the Wheel Of Fortune PH, Wheel Road, Alington, Norfolk, NR14 7NL. Consideration should be given to the potential impact of the Public House on future residents along with the impact on the future viability of the Public House of introducing noise sensitive receptors close to it.</li> </ul>	

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Likely impact on the listed Stacey Cottage to the south.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Current field entrance to the site, close to the existing junction with Fortune Green. Substantial hedge, at least part of which may need to be removed. On a bend in Wheel Road and extends to the junction with Reeder's Lane.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, with no obvious concerns.	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Pub, residential and open countryside. No compatibility issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Road frontage to Wheel Road and Reeder's Lane, only immediately adjoining development is the pub.  Currently no boundary to the south, as the site subdivides a larger field.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Substantial hedgerow, with a ditch, to the Wheel Road frontage, includes tree(s) at the Reeder's Lane junction.	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)	Two sets of overhead powerlines across the site, which may require diversion or accomodating in any development layout.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views of the site from the village are limited by the existing hedge, although any removal to create an access would make the site significantly more open. The site is more open from the south and can be seen through the field entrance on Reeder's Lane. Larger Revised site close like to be visible from Nichols Road.	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Whilst the site is effectively in gap between the Wheel of Fortune pub and housing on Burgate Lane, with additional housing on the opposite side of Wheel Road, the site has a rural feel, with a substantial hedge and ditch to the Wheel Road frontage and a more open aspect to the south.  Careful consideration needs to be given to any access, with the bend in Wheel Road and junctions with Reeder's Lane and Fortune Green, plus the potential need to remove at least part of the frontage hedge.  If this site is to be developed, there may be merit in making it a larger development that makes better use of the available land.	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		
<b>Conclusion</b>		Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Not currently being marketed, but is promoted by a house builder.	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Site promoted by an established house builder who also completed the nearby 2015 allocation on Wheel Road. No known constraints to delivery.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	The site is promoted at a very low density, should open space/landscaping etc be required. It is not envisaged that further off-site improvements will be required.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes, at the time of submission of a smaller site in 2016	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is a relatively unconstrained greenfield site, reasonably well located in terms of access to local services/facilities. Wheel Road at the site frontage is narrow and has restricted forward visibility and the carriageway narrows in vicinity of the Wheel of Fortune PH. The Reeders Lane/Wheel Road/Burgate Lane junction would also benefit from improvement. Whilst the 'pinch point' at the pub might be acceptable, the removal of the substantial frontage hedge (containing some larger trees) would significantly change the character of the area. The site would also impact unacceptably on the rural setting of Stacey Cottage to the south. Need to establish whether the 33Kv power lines are a constraint.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site quite rural in character, and currently well screened from surrounding development. However that screening may need to be removed to access the site. If this site is to be developed, there may be merit in making it a larger development that makes better use of the available land.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside, but on the opposite side of Wheel Road to the existing Development Boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter is a local house builder who states that the site is available and viable.

### **Achievability**

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Unreasonable** - The site is reasonably located in terms of local services and facilities and has few on-site constraints. The main concerns with the site relate to the removal of the substantial frontage hedge (with trees) to facilitate the necessary highways improvements, across the whole site frontage from the Reeders Lane/Burgate Lane junction (which itself would require improvement) to the Wheel of Fortune. This would significantly change the character of the area and raise concerns in terms of wider landscape character. Would also unacceptably impact on the rural setting of the listed Stacey Cottage to the south of the site.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 05/11/20

SN0434

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0434
Site address	Bergh Apton Road, rear of Alberta Piece, Alington
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	No relevant history.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.83ha
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocated site.  (Promoted for approximately 10 dwellings as a SL extension)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Minimum of 14.5/ha.  (Promoted for 12/ha)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access from Bergh Apton Road, although the road appears quite narrow at that point, with no footways and a hedge along most of the frontage (on top of a low bank).</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Green, not acceptable due to highway safety concerns. Bergh Apton Road is narrow with no continuous footway to Church Road / school and does not appear to be enough highway to provide improvements</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><b>Part 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Primary School - 175m Green Pastures Farm Shop - 1,500m A146 Hellington Corner bus stop - 1,600m (routes include X2, X21, X22)</p> <p>Various small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity</p>	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village Hall with Recreation Ground - 375m Yelverton Football Club - 575m Pub - 425m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified on/close to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for NR14 7NT area.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>Greenfield site with no known issues.</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services:</b> Amber</p> <p>Land Quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potentially contaminated sites are located within 500m of the site in question on the PCLR or Landmark databases.</li> <li>- The Epoch 5 2500:1 scale map shows a small sewage treatment works located on the site in question which is a potential source of land contamination. The risk to the site from this former small sewage treatment works would be expected to be low having regard to its age, but a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required to confirm this.</li> </ul> <p><b>NCC Minerals &amp; Waste</b> - sites over 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	<p>None identified</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> - Few or no constraints.</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	Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Poringland Settled Plateau Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>No designated landscapes.</p> <p>Site has hedging (on top of a bank) on the road frontage, and single storey dwellings to the west. To the north and east the site is very open to the surrounding countryside. Consequently the site could potentially have a significant impact on the local landscape.</p> <p>Grade 3 agricultural land.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Although one (single storey) dwelling currently fronts this part of Bergh Apton Road, the development would break out from the current form in the area. A small exceptions site on the opposite side of the road doesn't extend any further than the existing dwellings and has been designed with a heavily landscaped edge on when approaching from Bergh Apton.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designated sites within close proximity. would need to assess the value of the existing hedge.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No designated heritage assets close to the site.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Bergh Apton Road is relatively narrow, with no footways, although potentially the site could provide a footway. Otherwise links to the current network serving the village, which links to the A146 and Poringland.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, not acceptable due to highway safety concerns. Bergh Apton Road is narrow with no continuous footway to Church Road / school and does not appear to be enough highway to provide improvements</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Low-density single-story development to the west, arable/open countryside to the remaining boundaries.</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services</b>, Amenity: - No issues observed.</p>	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Would not fit particularly well with the existing form of development, extending along Bergh Apton Road. Adjoining development is also single story only.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Has a frontage to Bergh Apton Road with existing field access, but may require removal of a significant part of the hedgerow, which would make the site significantly more visible.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield, with no obvious concerns.	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Single story dwellings to the west, which may impact on the form of development. Agricultural to the remaining boundaries. No compatibility issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site with a bank to the road frontage.	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow on a bank to the south/road frontage. Domestic boundaries to the west, open to the north and east.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow to the south.	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)	Greenfield, therefore unlikely to be contaminated.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open aspect to the east makes the site very visible when approaching from Bergh Apton. Concern that removal of the hedgerow to provide access would make the site very visible in the wider landscape.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is generally out of keeping with the form of the existing settlement, and could be quite prominent in the landscape if the hedgerow needs to be removed to provide access.	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		
<b>Conclusion</b>		Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Not currently being marketed, but is promoted by a house builder.	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Site promoted by an established house builder who also completed the nearby 2015 allocation on Wheel Road. No known constraints to delivery.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Landowner also controls and to the south, should open space/landscaping etc be required. It is not envisaged that further off-site improvements will be required.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes, at the time of submission in 2016	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	



## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

Site is an unconstrained greenfield site, relatively well located in terms of access to local services/facilities.

Removal of the hedgerow for access would make the site even more visible in the landscape.

### Site Visit Observations

Doesn't sit well with the form and character of the existing settlement, would clearly be extending out in a different direction to the existing pattern, with no development on the opposite side of the road. Landscape on the opposite side of the road is very open, and any removal of the hedgerow to access this site would make this site very visible in that open landscape. Recent nearby scheme on the corner of Nichols Road (which fronts existing development on both roads) has required extensive landscaping to the rear to minimise the impact.

### Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but adjoins the existing Development Boundary at the western end of the site.

### Availability

Promoter is a local house builder who states that the site is available and viable.

### Achievability

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. Whilst the site is adjacent to the existing Development Boundary and within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities, actual accessibility is much more limited due to the constraints of the local highway network. The site also provides an attractive rural setting where the site is very visible when approaching from Bergh Apton, where the removal of hedgerows to provide site access would cause harm to the wider landscape. Development of the site would represent an out of character breakout into the open countryside. Few other constraints have been identified.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: November 2020

## SN0435

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0435
Site address	Land at Burgate Lane (Glebe Field), Alington
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	None recent relevant history.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.67ha
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Promoted for 8 dwellings, although site large enough for an allocated site.
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12 dwellings/ha as promoted.
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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Frontage to Burgate Lane with existing access. However there are significant trees on the site frontage. No continuous footways.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Primary School - 700m Aldis & Son Farm Shop - 1,100m  Various small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity.	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Pub - 425m Village Hall Recreation Ground - 1,000m Yelverton Football Club - 1,175m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified on/close to the site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for NR14 7NP area.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>Greenfield site with no known issues.</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services</b> – Green</p> <p>Land Quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potentially contaminated sites are located within 500m of the site in question on the PCLR or Landmark databases other than a former agricultural repair workshop (about 210m from the site in question). This is not considered significant.</li> <li>- Nothing of concern with regard to land quality noted on the historic OS maps.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	None identified.	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 and Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Front of the site in Chet Tributary Farmland. Rear of site Poringland Settled Farmland.	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>No designated landscapes.</p> <p>Relatively well contained site, main impact would be the potential loss of trees on the frontage.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Adjoining properties are very low density and significantly set back from the road frontage. Development in depth would not be particularly in keeping with this site.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designated sites within close proximity.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets close to the site.  HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	There a no footways on this connecting this part of Burgate Lane to the main part of the village.  NCC Highways – Red, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential on either side (west and west) and on the opposite (south) side of Burgate Lane. Fortune Game Farm to the rear (north).  SNC Env Services, Amenity: - No issues observed.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	North side of Burgate Lane is low density residential largely set back from the road. Development in depth would generally appear out of character.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Unlikely without the loss of significant trees.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Appear to be in use a grazing paddock. Greenfield, with no obvious concerns.	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Principally low density residential. May wish to keep a reasonable buffer to the game rearing business to the north. No compatibility issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site with no issues.	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature trees and heading around much of the site. In particular the trees on the frontage are a significant feature in the street scene. Boundaries with the neighbouring properties are more domestic in character with low hedges and/or fencing.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Mature trees on the site frontage are the most significant feature.	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)	Greenfield, therefore unlikely to be contaminated.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Public views are limited to those from the road frontage. Relatively well contained site with limited views in or out.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Limitations of the access and the form and character of this site and its surroundings make it unlikely to be suitable.	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Detached from the existing Development Limit.	Amber



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private.	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Not currently marketed, but the site is promoted by a house builder.	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years; Sste promoted by a local house builder, who is also part owner of the site.	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Site promoted by an established house builder who also completed the nearby 2015 allocation on Wheel Road. No known constraints to delivery.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Improved pedestrian access to the facilities in the village.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Unlikely to be applicable to this site.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No specified.	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size for allocation. The site itself is relatively unconstrained, however the form and character of the neighboring residential development and the mature trees on the site frontage limit the potential of this site.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Limitations of the access and the form and character of this site and its surroundings make it unlikely to be suitable.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside and detached from the current Development Boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter is a local house builder who states that the site is available and viable.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. Whilst there is an existing site access via Burgate Lane, there are significant trees on the site frontage that would prevent achieving a satisfactory access with sufficient visibility splays. These trees also provide a significant feature in the street scene, where their removal would cause harm to the landscape. Whilst the site is in close proximity to some local services and facilities, there are no footways along this part of Burgate Lane to the main part of the village, where there is also a lack of continuous footways. The adjoining properties are very low density and significantly set back from the road frontage, therefore development of the site would not be in keeping with the form and character of the neighboring development.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: November 2020

## SN0529SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0529SL
Site address	Land east of Nichols Road, Alington
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	Site was rejected by the Inspector at the last Local Plan Examination (Main Modification 45) as it <i>'does not logically form an infill plot within the settlement'</i> .
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.37ha
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	SL, for approx. 6 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	16 dwellings/ha as promoted.
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	<p>Nichols Road narrows noticeably once past the School, and the access to the recent development on the corner of Nichols Road/Bergh Apton Road is taken from the latter and runs to the rear of the properties fronting Nichols Road. It appears that the off-carriageway footway could be extended to serve this site.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - Nichols Road is narrow and would ideally need to be widened. Affordable housing development adjacent has provided a new footpath, which could be extended. NCC would prefer frontage accesses, rather than rear driveways like the adjoining scheme.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Primary School - less than 50m Green Pastures Farm Shop - 1,675m A146 Hellington Corner bus stop (routes inc. X2, X21, X22) - 1,750m</p> <p>Various small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity.</p>	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village Hall with Recreation Ground - 400m Yelverton Football Club - 550m Pub - 400m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified on/close to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for NR14 7QD area.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>Greenfield site with no known issues.</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services</b> - Green</p> <p>Land Quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potentially contaminated sites are located within 500m of the site in question on the PCLR or Landmark databases.</li> <li>- Nothing of concern with regard to land quality noted on the historic OS maps.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>NCC Minerals &amp; Waste</b> - sites under 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, <u>if the site area was amended to over 1ha</u>, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	None identified.	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> )		Chet Tributary Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>No designated landscapes.</p> <p>Site is the corner of an agricultural field, with low bank/verge to the road frontage, but no boundaries to the two sides open to the field.</p> <p>Site is similar in scale the recent adjoining development on the corner with Bergh Apton Road, which has significant landscaping to the rear (east).</p> <p>Grade 2 Agricultural Land</p> <p><b>SNC Landscape Meeting</b> – Acceptable in context of development already built on this corner. Opportunity to enhance the entrance to the village from the south. No DM4.8 issues</p>	Amber
Townscape	Green	<p>Adjoins recently completed exceptions sites, and also faces properties on the opposite side of Nichols Road.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> - should have front vehicle access.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designated sites within close proximity.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No designated heritage assets close to the site.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> - Green</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space	Green



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Nichols Road is narrow at this point (single carriageway), although there appears to be the potential to extend the off-carriageway footway to serve the site. Otherwise links to the current network serving the village, which links to the A146 and Poringland.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – 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> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> – Previous comments re accessibility to services an error. Nichols Road is narrow and would ideally need to be widened. Affordable housing development adjacent has provided a new footpath, which could be extended. NCC would prefer frontage accesses, rather than rear driveways like the adjoining scheme.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Residential (mixed densities) and agricultural. Public footpath crosses the field to the south.</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services</b>, Amenity: - No issues observed.</p>	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Although the site extends the settlement into the countryside, the adjacent exceptions housing scheme and properties opposite	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Narrowness of the carridgeway would appear to be the main constraint.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield, with no obvious concerns.	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to the north and west, agricultural to the remaining boundaries. No compatibility issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site with slight bank to the road frontage.	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	No defined boundaries to the south and east (open agricultural field). C21st housing to the north. Mixed housing on the opposite side of the road to the	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	None directly effecting the site.	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)	Telegraph poles/wires on the road frontage (which also run in front of the existing housing on the east side of the road).	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Mostly seen with a backdrop of existing housing. Open on two sides,	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Small site with no defined boundary on two sides. Nichols Road is narrow (single carriageway). However, small Development Boundary extension could be possible.	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		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Attached to the existing Development Boundary at the western end of the site.	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private.	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No evidence of marketing.	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately. Promoted by an agent with indicative layout. Footpath has been diverted to the south to avoid the site.	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Indicative layout, diversion of existing footpath to the south, single ownership.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Footway/highway improvement. Extension to 30mph speed limit.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	n/a site too small to require affordable housing.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None proposed.	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size for a SL Extension. No overriding constraints and site is reasonably located to access local services/facilities. Greenfield site, adjacent to the existing development boundary.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Small site with no defined boundary on two sides. Nichols Road is narrow (single carriageway). However, small Development Boundary extension could be possible, with landscaping, particularly to the eastern boundary.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside, but adjoins the Development Boundary to the north.

### **Availability**

Promoter states that the site is available.

### **Achievability**

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation. Existing footpath has been diverted to aid this.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site a **REASONABLE** size for a settlement limit extension. The site is adjacent to the existing Development Boundary and within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities. However, development would need to respect the linear pattern of existing development on the western side of Nichols Road and include for appropriate landscaping, particularly to the eastern boundary. Development could potentially enhance the entrance to the village from the south. It has also been noted that a frontage access is preferred, rather than rear driveways like the adjoining scheme and that the footpath provided via the adjacent affordable housing development could be extended to serve this site.

### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes (SL only)

### **Rejected:**

Date Completed: November 2020

SN0533

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0533
Site address	Land east of The Street, Bergh Apton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.57
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	Settlement limit change to allow 5 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential access constraints could be overcome</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - This part of the Street is better/wider and suitable access to the site could be achieved. However, issues exist with the wider network and the Cookes Road/The Street junction.</p>	Amber

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"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Alpington &amp; Bergh Apton school is 1.7 km with no footways</p> <p>Farm shop with post office is 2km metres away with no footways</p> <p>Bus service is 1.3km away</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Bergh Apton village hall is 250 metres away with no footways</p> <p>The Wheel of Fortune PH in Alpington is 2 km away with no footways until you get the settlement of Alpington</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	<p>Upgrades to waste water treatment capacity may be required</p> <p>AW advise sewers crossing the site</p>	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains drainage and electricity supply can be provided	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No likely contamination	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Potential harm but can be mitigated  <a href="#">SNC Landscape Meeting</a> - Significant roadside hedge, and potential conflict with DM4.8	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Projects away from existing development on eastern side of The Street however if appropriately designed can be mitigated to relate well to existing pattern of development  <b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> – Amber, could hedgerow be retained? This would retain rural character to some extent, but still result in more of a built-up character. Bergh Apton is characterised by different clusters and this would go some way to linking two separate clusters along Church Road. This development would be the third similar development in this area and in terms of village evolution it may be better to develop elsewhere. Concerned that Bergh Apton is starting to lose dispersed character of several separate clusters.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Potential to mitigate any harm	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Development could affect setting of Listed building opposite</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> – Amber, the listed building is a small cottage with quite a localised setting – retaining hedge would help to preserve setting.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential constraints on local road network</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - This part of the Street is better/wider and suitable access to the site could be achieved. However, issues exist with the wider network and the Cookes Road/The Street junction.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	In townscape terms development of the site could be acceptable as extending the existing pattern of development south along the eastern side of The Street matching that on the western side. However, may affect setting of listed building.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	An access may be achievable but would require the loss of part or all of a hedgerow along the highway boundary	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	No demolition or other redevelopment issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to east and south, residential to north and to west on opposite side of The Street. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow on highway boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow on highway (western) boundary and northern boundary. No defined eastern boundary. Loss of habitat if highway boundary is lost to create access	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 likelihood of contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views restricted into site due to substantial hedge on highway boundary. Brief views possible from Dodgers Lane	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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 could continue existing pattern of development as an extension to the settlement limit however there are potential impacts in terms of the setting of the listed building opposite and the harm to the character of the area if the hedgerow needs to be removed	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score</b> <b>(R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Suitable for settlement limit extension in principle as adjacent to existing settlement limit. However, the site would have a cumulative impact in terms of being third in a series in this location which would start to coalesce the clustered form of development in Bergh Apton. Any removal of the substantial roadside hedge to create an access would significantly harm the character of the area (and require assessment under hedgerow regulations), and increase the impact on the nearby listed cottage. Whilst The Street in the immediate vicinity of the site is likely to be acceptable in terms of creating an access, the wider network issues remain.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is south of existing linear development which development of this site could continue however there are potential impacts in terms of the setting of the listed building opposite and the harm to the character of the area if the hedgerow needs to be removed.

### **Local Plan Designations**

In open countryside adjacent to development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Unreasonable** - As with other parts of Bergh Apton, the wider highways network is a concern, although access to this site should be achievable from The Street. However, this access would be likely to require the removal of a significant roadside hedge, the loss of which in itself would be a concern, but which would also increase the impact of any development on the settlement pattern (emphasising the closing up of the currently dispersed pattern) and also on the nearby listed cottage.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 24 June 2020

## SN1012

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1012
Site address	Mill Field, Mill Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	1993/0284 - refusal of four dwelling on the frontage of the site.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.96ha
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	Allocated site.
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for three self-build properties for family members, therefore a density 3 dwellings/ha.  (24 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:	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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Frontage to Mill Road, with existing field access. Visibility may be constrained by the existing trees.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> – Red. Mill Road has no footways and is narrow in places, and has relatively poor junctions at either end, would generally not support further development here.</p>	Red



Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Primary School - 1,025m Green Pastures Farm Shop - 625m A146/Hellington Corner bus stop - 725m (routes include X2, X21, X22)  Various small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Pub - 1,350m Village Hall with Recreation Ground - 1,300m Yelverton Football Club - 1,500m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.  AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified on/close to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for NR14 7PQ area.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>Greenfield site with no known issues.</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services</b> - Green</p> <p>Land Quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potentially contaminated sites are located within 500m of the site in question on the PCLR or Landmark databases.</li> <li>- Nothing of concern with regard to land quality noted on the historic OS maps.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Small area of 1/100 year Surface Water Floodrisk outside the site, in the highway	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> )		Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>No designated landscapes. Well contained site.</p> <p><b>SNC Landscape Meeting</b> – Unacceptable loss of hedgerow and mature trees, DM4.8 issues and incompatible with LCA.</p>	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	<p>Mill Road is characterised by relatively low-density frontage development, and anything other than a similar pattern is likely to be out of keeping.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> – limited frontage development – although it might be reasonable to move back the building line to fill the site and develop with a courtyard approach.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designated sites within close proximity.</p> <p>Mature trees and hedging to the front of the site, would need assessment.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>No designated heritage assets close to the site. Non-designated historic parkland at The Manor, Bergh Apton, approx. 275m south/south-east of the site.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> – Green, no heritage impact.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Access on to Mill Road which is one of the main links between the village and the A146. However, there are no footways in this part of the village.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> – Red. Mill Road has no footways and is narrow in places, and has relatively poor junctions at either end, would generally not support further development here.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Boarding cattery to the west, low density residential to the west and agricultural land to the front (south) and rear (north)</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services</b>, Amenity: - No issues observed.</p>	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Very rural aspect with low density residential frontage development along Mill Road. As such the any development would need to retain this low-density approach. Potential inter-visibility with the non-designated historic parkland at The Manor, Bergh Apton, limited by existing vegetation.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Double width entrance gate to the side, however visibility may be restricted by the existing trees.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield, with no obvious concerns.	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Potential disturbance from the neighbouring cattery, but otherwise no issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site with no obvious issues.	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and hedging to all boundaries, some of which may require protection.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Large trees to the site frontage, as part of an established hedge.	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)	Greenfield, therefore unlikely to be contaminated.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Relatively well enclosed, with limited views into the site.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Area is characterised by low density frontage development, and the site has a number of large trees on the road frontage. Any development would need to preserve the rural appearance of the site/location.	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		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Bergh Apton Development Boundary immediately to the west of the site.	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Site is promoted principally for self-build/family use.	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	iCompile searches undertaken in 2014 to establish any constraints to development of the site.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unlikely for the scale of development proposed. Access improvements.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Not required for the scale of development proposed.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Main constraints to the development of the site are likely to be achieving a suitable access whilst retaining the existing trees and keeping development in character with the surrounding development. Site only likely to be suitable for lower density frontage development, in keeping with the existing form/character. Possible issues with highway network.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Well contained site, with limited impact on the surrounding area, subject to retention of the frontage trees.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside, but existing Development Boundary is at the western side of the site, separated by an existing PROW.

### **Availability**

In family ownership, who wish to use the site for a limited number of low cost/self build units for family members.

### **Achievability**

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is **UNREASONABLE** to allocate or to amend the settlement limit. Mill Road is separate from the main settlement and the surrounding highway network is substandard with no safe walking route to the school and poor access at each junction end. The site extends behind the existing linear pattern of frontage development and would encroach further north which is out of character. In addition, there are significant existing trees and hedging along the frontage which would be lost with a negative impact on the landscape character.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: November 2020



## SN2006

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2006
Site address	South of Loddon Road (A146) and Gull Lane, Yelverton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	None recent
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.8ha - however net developable area acknowledged as less due to the flood risk constraints.
Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension	Allocated site - approx. 10 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	5.6 dwellings/ha gross
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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access is proposed from the A146 'Corridor of Movement', in the vicinity of the existing Gull Lane junction and almost opposite the Gull Inn, which is unlikely to be acceptable.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, 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. No to access of A146 Principal Route. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.</p>	Red

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"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Highway Garden &amp; Leisure - 600m</p> <p>Bus stop, A146, various services including the X2, X21, X22 - 500m</p> <p>Various small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		The Gull Inn - 175m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Two sets of overhead lines crossing the site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for NR14 7PL area.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>Greenfield site with no known issues.</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services</b> - Green</p> <p>Land Quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potentially contaminated sites are located within 500m of the site in question on the PCLR or Landmark databases.</li> <li>- Nothing of concern with regard to land quality noted on the historic OS maps.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>	Green
Flood Risk	Red	Zone 3a Flood risk and higher level of surface water flood risk affect the northern half of the site, including the proposed access point	Red

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> )		Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>No designated landscapes.</p> <p>Although the site is partially screened by vegetation, it is also clearly visible from the A146, as a meadow, with no related development.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	<p>Development of this site would not relate well to the existing pattern of development, which is very dispersed, with the most significant buildings in the area being of a commercial/agricultural nature.</p> <p>Limitations created by flood risk would exacerbate the problem, with development pushed to the rear of the site, in a band between the flood zone and the CWS.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Land immediately adjoining the southern boundary is a CWS.</p> <p>NCC Ecology – Amber, SSSI IRZ. Site is identified as a priority habitat - coastal floodplain and grazing marsh. Potential for protected species/habitats. Potential for protected species/habitats and BNG</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>The Gull Inn opposite the site is listed, although the presence of the A146 and the intervening vegetation are likely to limit any impacts.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Requires direct access to a Corridor of Movement, at a location where a 50mph speed limit applies and there are no footways to reach local services.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, 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. No to access of A146 Principal Route. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.</p>	<b>Red</b>

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Agricultural and woodland</p> <p><b>SNC Env Services</b> - Green</p> <p>Amenity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The site in question is adjacent to the A146 and thus road traffic noise (and possibly air quality) would be a consideration and we would recommend any application includes an acoustic report.</li> </ul>	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Unlikely to have any impact on the setting of the Gull Inn listed, as the parts closest too/visible from The Gull are at flood risk. Potential urbanising effect of another access point. This site would be out of keeping in townscape terms, as an isolated pocket of development in a rural setting.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Unlikely given the location of the access point on the A146, and the proximity of existing accesses to Gull Lane and the Gull Inn.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield, with no obvious concerns.	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Potential impact on the CWS immediately to the south west. Otherwise no compatibility issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Low-lying, appears to be level, rising slightly away from the road.	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Tree/hedge boundaries to all sides. Many mature trees to the rear/south-west (CWS) and to the north (identified as an orchard by the promoter), at the Gull Lane junction.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential impact on the CWS immediately the rear/south-west. No obvious features within the site, however there are numerous trees abound the site, and wide verge with ditch to the rear along the road frontage.	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)	Greenfield, therefore unlikely to be contaminated.	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	Clearly visible from the A146, appears as an enclosed rural field/meadow, with an attractive treed backdrop.	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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 well related to the existing pattern of development, an issue which is exacerbated by the layout that would be needed to avoid the Zone 3 flood risk. Access is proposed direct from a 50mph stretch of the A146, in close proximity to existing junctions.	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		
Country Wildlife Site	Immediately adjacent	
<b>Conclusion</b>	Not close to any existing Development Boundary.	Amber



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	The owner has received enquiries about the site.	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Cost of under re-routing and under-grounding the overhead power lines have been factored in.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Potential highway improvements required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated. The site is principally constrained by the developable area being between an area of Zone 3 flood risk and a CWS. Access direct for the A146 Corridor of Movement is likely to be a concern. Although bus stops and some local services are within walking distance, there is no safe route to easily reach these at present.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Development of the site would appear as an isolated group of houses in an otherwise largely rural setting, the effect being emphasised by the site itself being screened from nearby buildings by vegetation. Access will be required across the Zone 3 Flood Risk area, which would add to the urbanising effect of the site.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside (not close to any existing Development Boundary), CWS to the southwest, A146 Corridor of Movement.

### **Availability**

Actively promoted by the site owner.

### **Achievability**

Costs of creating a suitable access and under-grounding overhead lines may affect the likelihood of achieving affordable housing.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation due to the detrimental impacts on the landscape and townscape; Development of the site would be a significant extension into the countryside which would not reflect the existing form of the settlement on this side of Yelverton. Highways have also raised issues with the proposed access from the A146 'Corridor of Movement' where there is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site in the vicinity of the existing Gull Lane junction and almost opposite the Gull Inn. The site is also heavily constrained by flood risk where half of the site, including the proposed access point, is Flood Zone 3a and at a higher level of surface water flood. There is also potential impact on the CWS immediately to the south west.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: November 2020

## SN2015

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2015
Site address	Town Farm, Church Road, Bergh Apton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.28 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (aa) Allocated site (bb) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – 5 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	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	Green	Access should be achievable  <b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Alington & Bergh Apton school is 3 km with no footways, however Thurton Primary School is 2.8 km away (also no footway provision)  Farm shop with post office in Bergh Apton is 3.3 km metres away with no footways, whilst shop and post office in Brooke is slightly closer at 3 km  Bus service passes site	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Bergh Apton village hall is 1.4km away with no footways	
Utilities Capacity	Amber	AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Site promoter states that mains water and electricity are available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No history to suggest risk  <b>NCC Minerals &amp; Waste</b> - sites under 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, <u>if the site area was amended to over 1ha</u> , should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Relatively well contained in landscape by existing vegetation and landform	Green
Townscape	Green	Would not relate well to existing settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Should be able to mitigate any impact	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	No heritage assets in immediate vicinity  HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Constrained surrounding road network of rural lanes  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. No safe walking route to school	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Poor relationship to existing patterns of settlement as although adjacent to other residential properties these are relatively isolated from main clusters of dwellings in the village	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Safe access is likely to be achievable	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Part former garden space and part agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Existing farmhouse and farm site to north, residential to south, agricultural to west and east on opposite side of Church Road	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Relatively flat within site	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees on boundary. Relatively open boundary with land to rear	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential impact depending on level of vegetation that needs to be removed for access	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)	Not likely to be a particular risk of contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	View of site relatively limited due to vegetation on boundary	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site poorly related to main areas of settlement within Bergh Apton and therefore not suitable for inclusion within the settlement limit	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	5 – 10 years	Amber

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Suitable in size for settlement limit extension but removed from existing development boundaries. Highway constraints have been identified. There are no continuous footpaths in this location.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Although adjacent some other residential properties, the site is poorly related to main areas of settlement within Bergh Apton.

### **Local Plan Designations**

In open countryside remote from existing development boundaries.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for a settlement limit extension, due to its poor relationship to the main areas of settlement within Bergh Apton. Whilst the site is part of a smaller group of dwellings along Church Road , it is separated from the main village (and the local facilities) where there is no current Settlement Limit in this location. The site also provides an attractive rural setting where development would be detrimental to the existing rural form and character. Highway constraints have also been identified especially regarding the unsuitable local road network.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 24 June 2020

SN2022

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2022
Site address	The Dell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.32 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (cc) Allocated site (dd) SL extension	Settlement limit change - 5 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	(8 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:	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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Green	Access options are constrained  <b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Alpington & Bergh Apton school is over 3km km with no footways, however Seething school (not catchment school) is 1.8km also without footways  Bus service passes site	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		No services close by	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber		Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Applicant states that mains water and electricity are available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area with planned delivery for fibre technology	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Possible former structures on site  <b>NCC Minerals &amp; Waste</b> - sites under 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, <u>if the site area was amended to over 1ha</u> , should be included within any allocation policy.	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development here would erode rural character of landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Does not relate to existing settlement pattern	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Site in close proximity	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Site is in a conservation area  HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is highly constrained  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. No safe walking route to school	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Woodland and agricultural	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site does not relate to main areas of existing settlement within Bergh Apton and would harm rural nature of landscape, which is also in a conservation area	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access may be achievable but local road network is highly constrained and NCC Highways likely to object. Very remote from services	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Woodland with possible remains of previous structures on site	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Woodland to north and agricultural land on opposite side of road to south. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site rises from south to north	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site is wooded	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site is wooded with habitat potential	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 evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site are constrained by its wooded nature	Not applicable



Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site not suitable due to remote location from existing areas of settlement and services, and harm to landscape and conservation area	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is remote from any existing development boundary and from any settlement and there is no safe walking route to school. It would be development in the open countryside to the detriment of the landscape. There would be a negative impact on woodland.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Wooded site remote from the main areas of settlement within Bergh Apton.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside and remote from any development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is **UNREASONABLE** due to its remote location away from any settlement and services. The highway network is inadequate to support development in this location and there is no safe walking route to the school. There would be a loss of trees and habitat to the detriment of the surrounding landscape and environment.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 15 January 2021

## SN2023

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2023
Site address	Land south of Loddon Road and east Bergh Apton house
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.35 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (ee) Allocated site (ff) SL extension	Settlement limit change – 5 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	(9 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield (with some agricultural structures on the site)

### 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	Access options are constrained  <b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	Alington & Bergh Apton school is over 3km km with no footways, however Thurton school (not catchment school) is 2.1km also without footways  Bus service passes site	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		No services close by	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area with planned delivery for fibre technology	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Remains of former structures on site  <b>NCC Minerals &amp; Waste</b> - sites under 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, <u>if the site area was amended to over 1ha</u> , should be included within any allocation policy.	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development here would erode rural character of landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Does not relate to existing settlement pattern	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Site to south	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Adjacent to listed building  HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained  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. No safe walking route to school	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Parkland, residential and agricultural	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site does not relate to main areas of existing settlement within Bergh Apton and would harm rural nature of landscape	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access may be achievable but local road network is highly constrained and NCC Highways likely to object. Very remote from services	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Woodland with remains of previous structures on site	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Parkland to south, residential properties to east and west and agricultural land on opposite side of road to north. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site is wooded	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site is wooded with habitat potential	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)	Small risk of contamination from previous structures on site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site are constrained by its wooded nature	Not applicable



Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site not suitable due to remote location from existing areas of settlement and services, and harm to landscape	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is remote from any existing development boundary and from any settlement and there is no safe walking route to school. It would be development in the open countryside to the detriment of the landscape. There would be a negative impact on woodland.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Wooded site remote from the main areas of settlement within Bergh Apton.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside and remote from any development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is **UNREASONABLE** due to its remote location away from any settlement and services. The highway network is inadequate to support development in this location and there is no safe walking route to the school. There would be a loss of trees and habitat to the detriment of the surrounding landscape and environment.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 15 January 2021

## SN2117

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2117
Site address	Land adjacent to the village hall, Cookes Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Permission granted in 2012 (2012/0192) for solar panels in north-west of site
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.85 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (gg) Allocated site (hh) SL extension	Residential – sufficient size for an allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Not specified – at 25dph this would allow for 46 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:	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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Site frontage on Cookes Road</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> – Red. Road is narrow, with no footways/verges, may be difficult to achieve safe access to the site. Poor visibility at the Cookes Rd junction with The Street. Allocated site opposite the village hall was contrary to highways opinion and hasn't made any contribution to improving the local highway network.</p>	Red

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"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Alpington &amp; Bergh Apton school is 1.5 km with no footways</p> <p>Farm shop with post office is 2km metres away with no footways</p> <p>Bus service is 1.2 km away with no footways</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Bergh Apton village hall is adjacent to the site</p> <p>The Wheel of Fortune PH in Alpington is 1.8 km away with no footways until you get the settlement of Alpington</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Most of site is to rear of village hall reducing its impact on Cookes Road, however potential impact on historic parkland to north-west needs to be considered</p> <p><a href="#">SNC Landscape Meeting</a> - Roadside hedgerows subject to Hedgerows Regulations and trees, contrary to DM4.8. Limited development to the north so development would appear out of context.</p>	Red
Townscape	Amber	<p>Bergh Apton consists of a collection of small clusters of development. This would relate to one of the larger clusters although it would result in the formation of an estate form of development which is not characteristic of Bergh Apton</p> <p><a href="#">SNC Heritage &amp; Design</a> - Amber, Bergh Apton is characterised by different clusters. This development would be the third similar development in this area and in terms of village evolution it may be better to develop elsewhere in the village.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any impact should be able to be mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Listed building (Washingford Barn) immediately to the east although there are intervening trees, Listed Bergh Apton Manor to the northwest, in locally listed parkland.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> -this would be close to listed building and parkland and detrimentally affect the setting of the building.</p> <p><b>HES</b> – Red, within former extent of landscape park associated with Bergh Apton Manor House</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space and may be some potential to add to existing recreation space around village hall	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Access would be from Cookes Road to east of village hall which would necessitate removal of hedgerow</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. No safe walking route to school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - Road is narrow, with no footways/verges, may be difficult to achieve safe access to the site. Poor visibility at the Cookes Rd junction with The Street. Allocated site opposite the village hall was contrary to highways opinion and hasn't made any contribution to improving the local highway network.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agricultural, residential and village hall. Possible issues with use of village hall events would need to be considered	Amber



#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would result in a form of estate building that there is no precedent for in the settlement. However, its visual impact from Cookes Road would be limited and offers the opportunity along with recent development to the south of Cookes Road to create a more nucleated centre to the settlement around the village hall. Unlikely to have a significant impact on the setting of listed Washingford Barn, but this should be confirmed with Senior Heritage and Design Officer	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Cookes Road is straight, visibility spays would probably necessitate the removal of hedgerow and possibly some trees	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural parkland to north, large curtilage of listed converted barn to east, village hall to south and residential to south on opposite side of Cookes Road, another individual dwelling in large plot to west. Only compatibility issue is with events at village hall but these are managed successfully elsewhere in the district	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow and trees on boundary with Cookes Road to south and hedgerow on field to north. Trees and buses with Washingford Barn and village hall. Boundary to west is not established	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in trees and hedgerows potentially affected, particularly where part or all of hedge along Cookes Road would need removing to create access. No ponds on site but some close to east.	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)	Greenfield – unlikely to be contaminated	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views possible across site from Cookes Road over existing hedge but otherwise site reasonably contained from public view	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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 development of the site for 25 dwellings could be acceptable, subject to the views of Senior Heritage and Design Officer, Landscape Architect and Highway Authority. This would be at a density well under 25dph but would be more appropriate to the context of the area.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

Suitable size to be allocated and is adjacent to the settlement limit. There would be an impact on the landscape to the north of Cookes Road and the nearby heritage assets where the character is open with limited development.

### Site Visit Observations

The majority of the site is relatively well contained visually from public view, although development would have an urbanising effect on the Cookes Road frontage and would lead to the loss of part or all of the hedgerow on this frontage and potentially some trees. It would lead to the introduction of estate development but with sensitive design this could be acceptable.

### Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside but adjacent to the development boundary.

### Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

### Achievability

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

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is **UNREASONABLE** for development given the location separated from the main part of the settlement where the surrounding highway network is substandard with no safe walking route to the school. Whilst it is adjacent to the settlement limit there would be an impact on the landscape as it would extend into countryside to the north of Cooke's Road and the character is open with limited development. An appeal decision for two dwellings on the adjacent site would would '*cause material harm to the area's open and rural appearance*'. It would also have an impact on the nearby heritage assets including the historic parkland setting of Bergh Apton Manor, and nearby listed properties.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 22 June 2020

SN4030

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4030
Site address	Land at Mill Farm, Mill Road, Bergh Apton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Majority of site is outside of development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.64 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (ii) Allocated site (jj) SL extension	Either allocation of 12 dwellings or settlement limit extension – front of site is already within development boundary
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12 dwellings (16 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	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		Access should be achievable onto Mill Road  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, insufficient frontage for safe access, substandard highway network, no safe walking route to school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>		Alpington & Bergh Apton school is 880 metres with no footways  Farm shop with post office is 660 metres away with no footways  Bus service is 550 metres away	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Bergh Apton village hall is 1.2km away with no footways  The Wheel of Fortune PH in Alington is 1 km away with no footways until you get the settlement of Alington	Amber
Utilities Capacity		AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure		Promoter states that there is mains water, sewerage and electricity available. No known infrastructure prejudicing development on site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability		No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk		No identified flood risk  <b>LLFA</b> - Few or no constraints.	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> )		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment		Development of site would break out of existing pattern of development into open countryside	Amber
Townscape		Development would not relate well to linear pattern of development along Mill Road	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity		No designated sites close by  NCC Ecology – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Green
Historic Environment		No heritage assets in close proximity  HES - Amber	Green
Open Space		No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads		Road network is probably adequate to accommodate traffic from a very small number of new dwellings  NCC Highways – Red, insufficient frontage for safe access, substandard highway network, no safe walking route to school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses		Agricultural and residential	Green



#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Mill Road is characterised by linear development. This would introduce backland development intruding into the open countryside to the east of the existing pattern of development	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is likely to be achievable but would require the removal of hedges and trees	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to west and on opposite side of Mill Road to the north. Agricultural to east. No compatibility issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges and trees on all boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in trees and hedgerows. No ponds affected.	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 likely contamination issues	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is visually quite contained so no views into site	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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 would not relate well to existing pattern of development	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	5 – 10 years	Amber

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is just large enough to allocate, adjacent to settlement limit. However, it is remote from the school and it would extend development behind the exiting linear development along Mill Road. Also highway concerns and potential loss of hedgerow.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Field behind linear pattern of development. Development would therefore not relate well to existing pattern of development.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Majority of site is within open countryside but adjacent to the development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is **UNREASONABLE** to allocate or to amend the settlement limit. Mill Road is separate from the main settlement and the surrounding highway network is substandard with no safe walking route to the school and poor access at each junction end. The site is behind Mill Farm and does not relate well to the existing linear pattern of frontage development as it would extend development further south. In addition, there is insufficient frontage to provide adequate access into this site.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 25 June 2020

## SN5002

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5002
Site address	Land west of Fortune Green, Alington
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary, adjacent to south. Very small area to south in development boundary.
Planning History	None Adj to north- west: 2021/1512 Agricultural building approved.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6ha
Promoted Site Use, including (kk) Allocated site (ll) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	15 at 25 dph. Likely to be fewer if 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	Amber	<p>To south-west corner from road is a gated access on the frontage. Looks very narrow from plan, are adequate visibility splays achievable? May require removal of hedge; await HA consult.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Insufficient frontage to form safe/satisfactory access. No walking route to local facilities/ school.</p>	Red
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Primary School; 800m</p> <p>Aldis &amp; Son Farm Shop with post office; 1,200m</p> <p>Various small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity.</p>	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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Village Hall Recreation Ground; 1,100m Pub; 400m. Café at farm shop; 1,200m Pre-school (Cottontails) at village hall; 1,100m Yelverton Football Club; 1,300m	Green
Utilities Capacity		Promoter states there are no known constraints relating to utilities.  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Main sewer in road, other services available. Promoter states there are no known constraints relating to utilities infrastructure.	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	Green	Greenfield site. Promoter there have been no historical works undertaken on the site that would have resulted in any known ground stability issues or contamination.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1 No surface water flooding on site. SWFD 1-1000 along PRow on west boundary which is at a lower level.  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. Flood risk is very minor localised flooding to the site boundary.	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 Settled Plateau (top north-west corner)	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	B5 Chet Tributary Farmland  D2 Poringland Settled Plateau Farmland (top north-west corner)  Agricultural Land Classification; possibly Grade 2 Very good (Light Blue)	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is flat and set back from the road frontage behind existing development. Only the access would be visible from the road frontage if bungalows were built. It is contained and does not encroach into open countryside.  It is not clear whether the land is Grade 2, however it is not part of a larger agricultural field and appears that it has never been in productive use. It is currently overgrown scrubland.	Green
Townscape	Green	It is adjacent to existing residential development which comprises detached bungalows/chalet bungalows on good sized plots. Would need to be bungalows to reflect this. It would not be out of character.	Green



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations.</p> <p>Mature trees on boundaries. Promoter confirms a comprehensive ecological appraisal would be submitted and mitigation could be provided.</p> <p>The access could impact on hedging/trees to west of site, although already other accesses along this part of the road and the hedge to the west is of poor quality.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. Amber zone for great crested newts. Pond within 250m of boundary. SSSI IRZ but housing not listed- discharge of water to ground of more than 20m<sup>3</sup> requires Natural England consultation. No priority habitats. Not in Green Infrastructure Corridor.</p> <p>Adjacent to Alington FP11. Not clear how site would be accessed.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No assets affected. Nearest listed building is over 450m away.</p> <p><b>HES</b> – Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Wheel Road is narrow with no footpath.</p> <p>PRoW along west boundary, outside of site, accessible from the site.</p> <p>Assuming a suitable access can be achieved, the site links to the current network serving the village, which links to the A146 and Poringland.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Insufficient frontage to form safe/satisfactory access. No walking route to local facilities/ school.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Field to north. Residential to east and south.</p> <p>Fortune Paddock - agricultural livestock to north-west, a game farm rearing birds, with associated grassed area and menage to west of proposed access, all separated by the footpath which is enclosed by hedges/trees.</p>	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 07/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	None.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	The access is from the road frontage but it is narrow and need the Highway Authority to check if visibility is adequate, particularly to the west. Also the route in, adjacent to Wheelview, looks too narrow to accommodate an adequate access.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Undeveloped, overgrown grassland. Quite saturated when walking over it.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	The proposed access to the west boundary could have a negative impact on residential amenity of the existing bungalow.  Game farm with stabling/paddock buildings. Appears 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)	Trees, hedging, residential dwellings to east and south.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedges/trees on boundaries, pond to west of access.	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)	The site is undeveloped and no evidence of any previous use, suggests contamination is unlikely.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited by mature vegetation and footpath, rear residential gardens.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 07/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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>The site is contained within the form of the village and does not encroach into the landscape. A development could be achieved which is sensitive to the existing properties.</p> <p>The main concern from the site visit is that the access is inadequate both at the frontage and the width into the site.</p>	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)
Small part in development boundary		N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Site is under option to a developer.	N/A
When might the site be available for development	Immediately and developer is ready to start.	Green
Comments:		N/A

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Promoter states have confirmed deliverability of site in supporting document. Also, that there is an option agreement between the landowners and developer, and the developer works efficiently to deliver sites.	Green
Are on-site/off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Standard access improvements.	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. Promoter states have confirmed deliverability of affordable housing in supporting document and the developer will deliver it.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Broadly the site has few constraints, is visually contained and is well located in terms of distance to services. However, the site does not have sufficient frontage to create a suitable access and the access way is narrow and passes in very close proximity to the existing dwelling. Wheel Lane has limited footways and the site does not offer the opportunity to improve them.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is contained within the form of the village and does not encroach into the landscape. A development could be achieved which is sensitive to the existing properties.

The main concern from the site visit is that the access is inadequate both at the frontage and the width into the site.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

### **Availability**

The promoter has indicated that the site is under option to a developer.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is well contained within the landscape, is within a reasonable distance of facilities and has few constraints. However, the site frontage is not sufficient to create a suitable access and Wheel Road has limited footways and the site does not offer the opportunity to improve the situation.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022

SN5038

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5038
Site address	Land adjacent to Greenway, White Heath Road, Bergh Apton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2018/0556/F for garage and holiday let approved 27/04/2018. Later changes to plans through 2018/1140 and 2020/1116.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6
Promoted Site Use, including (mm) Allocated site (nn) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted as 1 for current owner (15 if assume 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	Has road frontage for access. Would need to check if adequate visibility splays achievable.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Insufficient frontage to form safe/satisfactory access. No walking route to local facilities/school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	Thurton Primary school; 1,300m Bus stop on A146; 1,300m  Narrow road and no footpath.	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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Village hall; 1,500m Pub; 1,200m Nursery; 1,300m Recreation; 1,500m  Closest facilities are in Thurton which are only accessible along a narrow unlit rural road with no footpath.	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	No known constraints  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Unknown.	Amber
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	No known issues.  <b>NCC Minerals &amp; Waste</b> - site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward 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

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1. Surface water flooding 1:100 along footpath to west, 1:1000 to north east.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. On-site flooding is very minor risk.</p>	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
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	<p>B5 Chet Tributary Farmland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification; 2 Very good (Light Blue)</p>	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Hedging has been cultivated to surround the two isolated properties but it is not characteristic of the surroundings. The landscape is very flat and open with large fields and limited field boundaries. Any new development would have a significant impact on the character of the area.</p>	Red
Townscape	Green	Outside development boundary in open countryside, therefore would have no impact on any townscape.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designations. Used as garden, limited natural habitat.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Green. SSSI IRZ but housing not listed - discharge of more than 5m<sup>3</sup>/day to ground requires Natural England consultation. Close to Bergh Apton RB8 (possible link up too?). Green risk zone for great crested newts (no ponds within 250m radius of boundary). Not in Green Infrastructure Corridor.</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No listed buildings nearby.</p> <p><b>HES</b> – Amber. Adj to cropmarks of Bronze Age burial mounds.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>White Heath Road is narrow with few passing places. It connects to the A146.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Insufficient frontage to form safe/satisfactory access. No walking route to local facilities/school.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Owner's detached bungalow to east. One other property beyond. Paddock to west &amp; open countryside surrounding this.</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?	None	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is proposed adjacent to the existing domestic access, further to the south-west. This is a narrow rural road with no footpath or lighting, and it appears that visibility would be limited as it would be on the outside of a bend.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential curtilage.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and open field which would be compatible uses.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat, no significant change in levels.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge to frontage and sides with fencing to rear.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Native hedging on boundaries, otherwise grassed with no trees within the site. No evidence of adverse ecological impact.	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
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is proposed for one dwelling only which would have a limited impact on the views but if the higher density sought was implemented this would have a significant detrimental impact on the open nature of the area.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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>Although Thurton has some services the site is relatively isolated as the road is very narrow and unlit with no footpaths and so walking would be hazardous and it is likely that road speeds would be high. It is not considered a sustainable location for any new development.</p> <p>In addition, any new development would change the character of the area and be remote from the existing settlements.</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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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	Amber
Comments:		N/A

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
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 highway improvements.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No – indicated that this would be a single dwelling for their own occupancy.	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is promoted for a single dwelling but extends to 0.6ha; the site frontage is not sufficient to create an access for a more extensive development. The development is not well related to any of the existing settlements in the vicinity and access to services would be to those facilities located in Thurton, rather the Bergh Apton. Access to Thurton would be via narrow, unlit roads, at the national speed limit, with no footways.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Although Thurton has some services the site is relatively isolated as the road is very narrow and unlit with no footpaths and so walking would be hazardous and it is likely that road speeds would be high. It is not considered a sustainable location for any new development.

In addition, any new development would change the character of the area and be remote from the existing settlements.

### **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 additional evidence has been submitted to support this

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site has been promoted for a single dwelling but is of a suitable size for allocation. The site is remote from any of the settlements in the vicinity and would effectively create an isolated dwelling (or small group of dwellings) in the countryside, with consequent impacts on the character of the locality. The closest facilities are in Thurton, which is accessed via narrow, unlit roads at the national speed limit, with no footways.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022