



# Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

## Site Assessments

Aslacton, Great Moulton and Tibenham

## Contents

SN0365SL .....	3
SN0459 .....	11
SN0459REVA .....	20
SN0554SL .....	30
SN0555 .....	38
SN0557SL .....	46
SN1041 .....	55
SN1042 .....	64
SN2005 .....	72
SN2008SL .....	81
SN2068 .....	89
SN0210SL .....	98
SN2112 .....	106
SN2118 .....	114
SN3008REV.....	123
SN5048 .....	132

## SN0365SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0365SL
Site address	Land east of Cherry Tree Road, Tibenham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Residential applications refused between 1975 – 2016 2019/1821 – retain commercial barn and c/u of barn to residential - approved
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.28 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 3 dwellings (up to 10 dph)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing access. NCC to confirm if access constraints can be overcome.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	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	Limited employment within 1800m	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> 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>		None	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No identified 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	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland  ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental landscape impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Within loose grouping of buildings so detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species but the impact could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of LB to south. Technical officer to confirm  <b>HES Amber score</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if any impact on network can be mitigated.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Commercial Residential Agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would impact on setting of listed farmhouse to south (and possible curtilage-listed barns to east)	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access. NCC to confirm if visibility can be achieved	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Commercial/residential/agriculture. Conflict with commercial activity could be mitigated through layout	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow with trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Several trees within boundary 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)	Should be investigated due to neighbouring commercial activity	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	In views from open land to west. Prominent in views along road	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)	Remote from and lacking connectivity to core services. Development would impact on setting of nearby heritage assets.	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	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)	Statement from promoter confirming same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	NCC to confirm access improvements	Amber
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?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not suitable for development due to remoteness from core services, lack of connectivity and potential impact on setting of heritage assets.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Remote from and lacking connectivity to core services. Development would impact on setting of nearby heritage assets.

### **Local Plan Designations**

There are no conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified.

### **Achievability**

Development would be required to retain right of way to commercial use and barns to east.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** due to its unsustainable location and the impact development would have on nearby heritage assets.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 08 July 2020

SN0459

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0459
Site address	Land off Church Road, Aslacton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2019/0460 (15 dwellings approved on land south of Church Road)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.71 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	23 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**

<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	Site bounded by Church Road and Muir Lane. Potential access constraints could be overcome through development  <b>Highways score</b> – Amber. Adjacent cul-de-sac not adopted so not available for pedestrian link to Church Road. C/w narrow at 3.6m (measured via NMB). Possible land available for f/w but would require removal of what may be a privately owned hedge. C/w could be widened over length of site frontage to allow safe access from east but safe pedestrian access to existing settlement is problematic.	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>120m walk to primary school (no footpath for 60m)</p> <p>No healthcare, retail or employment within 1800m</p> <p>Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops adjacent to site on Muir Lane</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>Mobile library</p> <p>No public house, village hall, pre-school or recreation facilities within 1800m</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed. AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, gas, electricity and foul drainage available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood zone 1. Identified area of flood risk along Muir lane to east (adjacent to the site boundary) would need to be taken into consideration</p> <p><b>LLFA score (GNLP)</b> – Green (standard information required)</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	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland ALC grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is open in wider views. Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated through design and boundary planting	Amber
Townscape	Amber	<p>Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated through design reflecting character and density of adjacent development</p> <p><b>Heritage &amp; Conservation Officer score</b> - This could continue linear form of development with housing to west. New development already approved to the south the road. Up to 40 units appears large location considering the small size of the village and rural location. The rural location needs to be taken into account in density, landscaping, type of units etc. Note the small public space to the east – this would be good in townscape terms to maintain the rural character of the lane.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species but the impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Red	<p>Development could have a detrimental impact on designated heritage assets but the impact could be reasonably mitigated</p> <p><b>Heritage &amp; Conservation Officer score</b>  – Amber. PP granted for development on the south side of the road impacts on the original HELAA score and that development impacts upon the setting of church Farm. Development of this site would not result in additional adverse impact although consideration should be given to having some space and reestablishment of the hedgerow to the corner/Muir Lane to enhance rural character at junction. Development to take into account the wider setting of Church Farm as seen from the junction.</p> <p><b>HES Amber score</b></p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Any potential impact on highway network could be reasonably mitigated. NCC to confirm.</p> <p><b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Residential development already approved on site to south. Consider impacts could be mitigated. Technical officer to confirm	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No formal access currently. NCC to advise and confirm status of verge to allow footpath extension	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Part of larger parcel of agricultural land. Open boundaries to north, east and south. Hedgerow along PROW on western boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow to western boundary along PROW.	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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in wider views from north and east. Site prominent in views along highways.	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)	Consider that impacts of development likely to be reasonably mitigated subject to footpath improvement and satisfactory access – NCC to confirm. To include screening of boundaries to minimise wider visual impact. Suitable for allocation for 25-30 dwellings in estate layout to reflect character and density of surrounding development.	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)
<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	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?	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)	Statement from promoter including landscape and utilities assessments.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Access and footpath improvement - NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site suitable for development subject to satisfactory layout and density and footpath/access improvements.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Consider that impacts of development likely to be reasonably mitigated subject to footpath improvement and satisfactory access – NCC to confirm. To include screening of boundaries to minimise wider visual impact. Suitable for allocation for up to 25 dwellings in estate layout to reflect character and density of surrounding development.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting LP designations – open countryside.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified.

### **Achievability**

No additional constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be the PREFERRED site subject to its development at a reduced scale to meet the aims of the VCHAP. Impacts associated with development in this location could be reasonably mitigated.

**Preferred Site:** Yes

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 23 June 2020

## SN0459REVA

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0459REVA
Site address	Land off Church Road, Aslacton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2019/0460 (15 dwellings approved on land south of Church Road)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.40 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for approx. 33 dwellings with a 1-acre village green, car parking related to the nearby school and possible public building with associated additional parking.
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 bounded by Church Road and Muir Lane. Potential access constraints could be overcome through development</p> <p><b>Highways score</b> (SN0459) – Amber. Adjacent cul-de-sac not adopted so not available for pedestrian link to Church Road. C/w narrow at 3.6m (measured via NMB). Possible land available for f/w but would require removal of what may be a privately owned hedge. C/w could be widened over length of site frontage to allow safe access from east but safe pedestrian access to existing settlement is problematic.</p> <p><b>Highways Meeting</b> (SN0459)- Subject to carriageway widening of Church Road to 5.5m between the existing layby west of the site to the junction with Muir Lane and at Muir Lane for full extent of site frontage. Provide 2.0m footway for full extent of Church Lane frontage and from Muir Lane junction north to the existing bus stop. Bus stops to be upgraded to comply with DDA requirements.</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>120m walk to primary school (no footpath for 60m)</p> <p>Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops immediately adjacent to site on Muir Lane</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>Mobile library</p> <p>Great Moulton Coronation Hall – 950m</p> <p>Fox &amp; Hounds PH – 1,400m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	<p>Wastewater capacity to be confirmed.</p> <p>AW advise sewers crossing the site (south east corner)</p>	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, gas, electricity and foul drainage available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood zone 1. Identified area of flood risk along Muir Lane to east (adjacent to the site boundary) would need to be taken into consideration</p> <p><b>LLFA score</b> (GNLP for SN0459)– Green (standard information required)</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 with Parkland</p> <p>Part Plateau Farmland</p>	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		<p>E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland</p> <p>B1: Tas Tributary Farmland</p> <p>ALC grade 3</p>	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Site is open in wider views.</p> <p>Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated through design and boundary planting</p>	Amber
Townscape	Amber	<p>Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated through design reflecting character and density of adjacent development</p> <p><b>Heritage &amp; Conservation Officer</b> (SN0459) - This could continue linear form of development with housing to west. New development already approved to the south the road. Up to 40 units appears large allocation considering the small size of the village and rural location. The rural location needs to be taken into account in density, landscaping, type of units etc. Note the small public space to the east – this would be good in townscape terms to maintain the rural character of the lane.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Hedges and trees present. Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species, but the impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Red	<p>Development could have a detrimental impact on designated heritage assets, but the impact could be reasonably mitigated</p> <p><b>Heritage &amp; Conservation Officer</b> (SN0459) – Amber. PP granted for development on the south side of the road impacts on the original HELAA score and that development impacts upon the setting of church Farm. Development of this site would not result in additional adverse impact although consideration should be given to having some space and reestablishment of the hedgerow to the corner/Muir Lane to enhance rural character at junction. Development to take into account the wider setting of Church Farm as seen from the junction.</p> <p><b>HES</b> Amber score</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	<p>Development would not result in the loss of any open space.</p> <p>The proposal is to create a new village green of 1ha.</p>	Green



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Any potential impact on highway network could be reasonably mitigated. NCC to confirm.</p> <p>FP6 along west boundary.</p> <p><b>Highways score</b> (SN0459) – Amber. Adjacent cul-de-sac not adopted so not available for pedestrian link to Church Road. C/w narrow at 3.6m (measured via NMB). Possible land available for f/w but would require removal of what may be a privately owned hedge. C/w could be widened over length of site frontage to allow safe access from east but safe pedestrian access to existing settlement is problematic.</p> <p><b>Highways Meeting</b> (SN0459) - Subject to carriageway widening of Church Road to 5.5m between the existing layby west of the site to the junction with Muir Lane and at Muir Lane for full extent of site frontage. Provide 2.0m footway for full extent of Church Lane frontage and from Muir Lane junction north to the existing bus stop. Bus stops to be upgraded to comply with DDA requirements.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Residential development already approved on site to south. Consider impacts could be mitigated. Technical officer to confirm	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No formal access currently. NCC to advise and confirm status of verge to allow footpath extension	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Part of larger parcel of agricultural land. Open boundaries to north, east and south. Hedgerow along PROW on western boundary and partial hedgerow to north on eastern boundary.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow to eastern and western boundary along PROW.	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	Open in wider views from north and east. Site prominent in views along highways.	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)	Consider that impacts of development likely to be reasonably mitigated subject to footpath improvement and satisfactory access. To include screening of boundaries to minimise wider visual impact. Suitable for allocation for approximately 33 dwellings in estate layout to reflect character and density of surrounding development.	

#### 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)
		N/A
		N/A
		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)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Within 5 years	Green
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)	Statement from promoter including landscape and utilities assessments.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Access and footpath improvement - NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	A 1 acre village green is proposed on the frontage, alongside circa 15 parking spaces related to the nearby school, plus the possibility of a public building and further parking.	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site itself has no overriding constraints and is suitable for development subject to satisfactory layout and density and footpath/access improvements.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Consider that impacts of development likely to be reasonably mitigated subject to footpath improvement and satisfactory access. To include screening of boundaries to minimise wider visual impact. Suitable for allocation for approximately 33 dwellings in estate layout to reflect character and density of surrounding development.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting LP designations – open countryside

### **Availability**

Promoter/developer has advised availability within plan period.

### **Achievability**

No significant constraints to delivery identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be a **REASONABLE** site subject to its development taking into account the highways requirements, and at a density/with landscaping to reflect the edge of village location. Following discussion with the Parish Council, the site would deliver benefits of a village green and parking to alleviate issues with the school (plus the potential for a further community building and parking, if required/supported locally. Impacts associated with development in this location could be reasonably mitigated.

**Preferred Site:** Yes

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 28 April 2022

## SN0554SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0554SL
Site address	Land at Hallowing Lane, Great Moulton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.09 ha (however the site promoter has indicated that a limited frontage site development only would be promoted)
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	NB: see above comment – the site has been promoted as an allocation (combined with SN0557SL and SN0555) but a reduced scale and number is shown on the submitted plan for this section and the site is therefore considered as a settlement limit extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approximately 5 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	Existing field access from Hallowing Lane. Access appears very constrained due to narrow lane. NCC to confirm  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	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	1.4 km walk to primary school (no footpath)  Limited employment within 1800m  Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops 900 m from 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>		Village hall and public house within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter confirms water and electricity	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Identified area of flood risk in NW corner and along Hallowing Lane	Amber

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> )		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland  ALC grade 3	



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is open in wider views. Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated through design and boundary planting	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated through design reflecting character and density of adjacent development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species but the impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on designated heritage assets but the impact could be reasonably mitigated  <b>HES Amber score</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if potential impact on highway network could be mitigated.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would impact on setting of heritage assets to NE. Technical officer to provide comment if the site is to progress as a reasonable alternative	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access. Upgraded access would be onto narrow lane and close to junction. May not be possible to achieve safe access. NCC to confirm	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open to larger parcel of farmland to north and west. Hedgerow including trees to east and south.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerows along road boundary well established and include significant tree	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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views from north and west. Limited views along Hallowing 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)	Would reflect form and character of existing development to west of Hallowing Lane. Impacts on highway, heritage assets and trees will require careful assessment. Poor walking environment to school due to narrow lanes and lack of footpath provision	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>	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</b> <b>(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 confirmed but support from Saffron	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</b> <b>(R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Ecology, flood risk and utilities assessments submitted	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted. Supported by Saffron	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not considered suitable as remote from some core services and highways, heritage and tree constraints also identified.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Careful design could mitigate townscape impacts. Developable area would be reduced by flood risk and tree constraints. Impact on highway network and on heritage assets would need careful consideration. Poor walking environment to school due to narrow lanes and lack of footpath provision.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside – no conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

### **Achievability**

Supported by Saffron who confirm capacity within their current building programme.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**UNREASONABLE** – the site is considered to be unsustainable and is subject to a number of constraints, including highways constraints.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 06 July 2020

## SN0555

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0555
Site address	Land off Old Road (adjacent to Hallowing Lane), Great Moulton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.46 ha (see also SN0554SL and SN0557SL)
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	27 dwellings 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**

<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	Existing access would require upgrading, NCC to confirm if constraints can be overcome  Highways score – Amber  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS COMMENTS TO BE CLARIFIED</b>	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	1.4 km walk to primary school (no footpath)  Limited employment within 1800m  Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops 900 m from 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>		Village hall and public house within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter confirms water and electricity. Advises that foul sewer crosses site but not confirmed.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Identified area of flood risk on western corner of site	Amber

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> )		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland ALC grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development of the site would have limited landscape impact which could be mitigated	Amber



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Development of site would infill space within settlement. Detrimental impact could be mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species but the impact could be reasonably mitigated. PEA submitted to support the promotion of the site.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on designated heritage assets but the impact could be mitigated  <b>HES Amber score</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if potential impact on highway network could be mitigated.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would impact on setting of heritage assets to north. Technical officer to provide comment if the site is considered as a Reasonable Alternative	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access would require upgrading. NCC to confirm if safe access can be achieved and impact on capacity of narrow lanes as appears very constrained	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Grassland paddock	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential/agriculture	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Intermittent hedgerow with trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site transected by established hedgerow. Significant trees in boundaries and within site. Pond in SW corner	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)	Promoter advises foul sewer crosses the site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views in and out of site limited by surrounding development, narrow lanes and landscape features	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)	Careful design would mitigate townscape impacts. Developable area would be reduced by flood risk and tree constraints. Impact on highway network and on heritage assets would need careful consideration. Poor walking environment to school due to narrow lanes and lack of footpath provision	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>	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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Not confirmed but support from Saffron	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)	Ecology, flood risk and utilities assessments submitted	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted. Supported by Saffron	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not considered suitable as remote from some core service. Heritage, flood risk, highways and tree constraints identified on the site.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Careful design could mitigate townscape impacts. Developable area would be reduced by flood risk and tree constraints. Impact on highway network will need careful consideration. Poor walking environment to school due to narrow lanes and lack of footpath provision.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside – no conflicting LP designations identified.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

### **Achievability**

Supported by Saffron who confirm capacity within their current building programme.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**UNREASONABLE** – the site is considered to be unsustainable and is subject to a number of constraints, including highways constraints.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 06 July 2020

## SN0557SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0557SL
Site address	Sites between Ketts Farm and Orchard Farm, Great Moulton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.36ha (see also SN0554SL and SN0555)
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Site promoted for 7 dwellings – 19dph  25 dph = 10 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	Existing field access would require upgrading, NCC to confirm if constraints can be overcome.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <b>Part 1:</b> <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	1.4 km walk to primary school (no footpath)  Limited employment within 1800m  Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops 900 m from 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>		Village hall and public house within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Water and electricity	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Identified area of flood risk on western half of site	Amber

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> )		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland ALC grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development of the site would have limited landscape impact which could be mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Development of site would infill space within settlement. Detrimental impact could be mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species but the impact could be reasonably mitigated. PEA submitted to support the promotion of the site.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on designated heritage assets but the impact could be mitigated  <b>HES Amber score</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if potential impact on highway network could be mitigated.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would impact on setting of heritage asset to west. Technical officer to provide comment if the site is to be considered appropriate as a SL extension	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access would require upgrading. NCC to confirm if safe access can be achieved and impact on capacity of narrow lanes as appears very constrained	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential/agriculture	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow separating existing development	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow to all boundaries with trees along northern edge	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)	O/H lines crossing site with telegraph poles at southern end	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from Old Road to south. Otherwise, visually contained	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)	Poor walking environment to school due to narrow lanes and lack of footpath provision Heritage, flood risk and highways constraints would limit scale of development. Unlikely to bring forward sufficient numbers.	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>	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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Not confirmed but support from Saffron	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)	Ecology, flood risk and utilities assessments submitted	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	N/A	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not considered suitable as remote from some core services and heritage, flood risk and highways constraints identified.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Poor walking environment to school due to narrow lanes and lack of footpath provision Heritage, flood risk and highways constraints would limit scale of development. Unlikely to bring forward sufficient numbers.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside – no conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

### **Achievability**

Supported by Saffron who confirm capacity within their current building programme.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Unreasonable** – The site is considered to be remote from some of the core services. Identified constraints that would impact upon development would include heritage, flood risk and highways issues.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 06 July 2020

## SN1041

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1041
Site address	Land at Pottergate, Aslacton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Outline permission for residential development refused – pre 1974
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.4 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocated
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 7 dph  (Promoted for 7-10 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	Amber	Field access off Pottergate Street. Potential access constraints could be overcome through development  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	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	1km walk to Aslacton and Fornsett primary schools (no footpath)  No healthcare, retail or employment within 1800m  Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops sited 120m away on Muir Lane	

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>		Mobile library  No public house, village hall , pre-school or recreation facilities within 1800m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Northern part of site in FZs 2 & 3. Identified SW flood risk along Pottergate St and Muir Lane and in SW and SE corners of site.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Rural River Valley and Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland  ALC grade 3	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site prominent in views along Pottergate St. Detrimental impacts could be mitigated through design and landscaping	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Limited development proposed so detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species but the impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of LB close to western site boundary. Technical officer to confirm (if the site is considered appropriate for allocation)  <b>HES Amber score</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Any potential impact on highway network could be reasonably mitigated. NCC to confirm.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agriculture and residential – compatible	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would impact on open setting of LB near western boundary. Technical officer to advise if the site is considered appropriate to be taken forward	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No formal access currently. NCC to advise if visibility achievable	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agriculture – no significant conflicts identified	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Ground level rises from north to south	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow with trees to southern, eastern and south western boundaries. Remaining western boundary open	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees – require assessment (if the site is considered appropriate to be taken forward)	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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views along Pottergate Street. More limited views from Muir Lane but not fully visually contained	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 remote from most services and lack of footpath provision creates poor walking environment. Development likely to have detrimental impact on townscape, landscape of river valley and heritage assets. Identified flood risk. Not considered suitable for allocation	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)
Designated river valley		
<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	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)	Statement from promoter confirming same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Access and footpath improvement - NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	N/A	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not suitable for development due to issues of landscape, townscape, heritage assets, flood risk, highways and lack of connectivity to local services.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site remote from most services and lack of footpath provision creates hostile walking environment. Development likely to have detrimental impact on townscape, landscape of river valley and heritage assets. Identified flood risk. Not considered suitable for allocation.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside and designated river valley.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified.

### **Achievability**

No additional constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE due to both the on- and off-site constraints that have been identified as well as the poor connectivity of the site.

### **Preferred Site:**

### **Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 25 June 2020

## SN1042

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1042
Site address	Land at Church Road, Aslacton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2019/0460 (pending) – 15 dwellings on adjacent site
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.7
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 11 dph  (Promoted for 30-40 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	Narrow field access from Church Road bounded by school and residential property  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	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	Short and safe walk to primary school  No healthcare, retail or employment within 1800m  Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops within 250m	

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>		Mobile library  No public house, village hall , pre-school or recreation facilities within 1800m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewers and electricity available to site  AW advise sewers crossing the site	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No SW issues identified  <b>LLFA score (GNLP)</b> – Green (standard information required)	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland  ALC grade 3	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site visually contained by hedgerow along boundaries. Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated through design reflecting character and density of adjacent development and reduction in developable area	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species but the impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Any detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated  HES Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	Development would have an unacceptable impact on functioning of local roads that could not be reasonably mitigated  Highways score – Red. Existing track from Church Road is too narrow to form an acceptable access and would require third party land to widen, provide footways and an acceptable junction layout / visibility splays. Surrounding highway network is substandard and not suitable for scale of development proposed.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential School	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Sufficiently separated and screened from nearest heritage assets. No direct impacts subject to design	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access substandard, third party land would be required for improvement.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential/school	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	PROW along eastern boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerows to boundaries containing some significant trees	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)	O/H lines crossing north east corner of 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 and out of site limited by hedgerow boundaries	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)	Large site so development would harm form and character of existing settlement though could be mitigated by reducing site area. Potential impacts on residential amenity and heritage assets could be mitigated through design. Significant access constraints which are unlikely to be resolved so not considered suitable for allocation. NCC to confirm.	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>	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</b> <b>(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	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</b> <b>(R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Access improvement - NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Open space for school is offered by promoter	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Consider that the site is not suitable for development due to significant access constraints.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Large site so development would harm form and character of existing settlement though could be mitigated by reducing site area. Potential impacts on residential amenity and heritage assets could be mitigated through design. Significant access constraints which are unlikely to be resolved so not considered suitable for allocation.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside; no conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified.

### **Achievability**

Access improvements would rely on third party land.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE due to the significant access constraints which it is not considered to be possible to overcome. In its promoted form the site is also of a scale considered to be harmful to the form and character of the area.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 25 June 2020

## SN2005

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2005
Site address	West of Woodrow Lane, Aslacton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.5 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocated
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 12 dph  (Promoted for 20-30 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



Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
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	No formal access. NCC to confirm if potential access constraints could be overcome.  <b>Highways score – Amber</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <b>Part 1:</b> <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	1.9 km walk to primary school (no footpath)  Limited employment within 1800m  Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops 250m from 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 public house, village hall, pre-school or recreation facilities within 1800m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has not advised that any utilities available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Area of identified flood risk across western half of site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland  ALC grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Would have detrimental impacts on landscape which could be mitigated by reduction in area	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Development of whole site would have a detrimental impact on form and character which could not be mitigated. Limited site area would reduce this impact	Amber/Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species but the impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No detrimental impact on heritage assets  HES Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on highway network could be mitigated  CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential/agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No existing access. NCC to confirm feasibility of achieving visibility on this bend. Any new access would be likely to require significant loss of hedgerow	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Grazing	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	All boundaries enclosed by hedgerow which also intersects site. Some significant trees.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees within hedgerow bounding and transecting 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)	No evidence	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Quite visually contained but can be viewed from road	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 whole site would have detrimental impact on townscape, landscape and residential amenity though could be mitigated by reducing site area. Access constraints that would impact on landscaping and character of lane	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>	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	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)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Access improvement - NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not suitable as development of whole site would harm form and character of settlement. Appears to be significant access constraints which would also result in loss of hedgerow.

Lack of footpath provision would increase reliance of private car to access local services.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Development of whole site would have detrimental impact on townscape and residential amenity though could be mitigated by reducing site area. Constraints to provide satisfactory access.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified.

### **Achievability**

No additional constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** as it would have a detrimental impact on the townscape. Other identified constraints include poor connectivity and highways concerns.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 26 June 2020



## SN2008SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2008SL
Site address	Overwood Lane, Great Moulton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	PP refused for residential development pre-1974
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.33 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 9 dph  (Promoted for 1-3 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	Shared access off Overwood Lane. Access constraints could potentially be overcome through development.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <b>Part 1:</b> <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	1.3 km walk to Aslacton and Forncett primary schools (no footpath)  No healthcare, retail or employment within 1800m  Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops sited 350m away on Muir Lane	

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 public house, village hall , pre-school or recreation facilities within 1800m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site lies outside the proposed fibre installation areas	Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Identified SW flood risk along Overwood Lane which would need to be taken into consideration	Green

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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland  ALC grade 3	
Townscape	Amber	Site prominent in views along Overwood Lane. Detrimental impacts could be mitigated during development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Isolated from nearest settlement although detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species but the impact could be mitigated	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of LBs to west. Technical officer to confirm (if the site is considered appropriate to progress)  <b>HES Amber score</b>	Amber
Transport and Roads	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Any potential impact on highway network could be reasonably mitigated. NCC to confirm.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
	Green	Agriculture and residential – compatible	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would impact on open setting of LBs further west along shared access. Technical officer to advise	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Improvement would be required. NCC to confirm if visibility could be achieved	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential/agriculture – no conflicts identified	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Ground level rises to north	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow. PROW along northern boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow to boundaries and pond outside of southern boundary	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)	O/H lines and TP along front boundary	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views to and from farmland to the east	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 remote from most services and lack of footpath provision creates poor walking environment. Development likely to have detrimental impact on townscape and heritage assets.	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>	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	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)	Statement from promoter confirming same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	N/A	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not suitable for development due to issues of landscape, townscape, heritage assets and lack of connectivity to local services.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site remote from most services and lack of footpath provision creates poor walking environment. Development likely to have detrimental impact on townscape and heritage assets.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified.

### **Achievability**

Shared private access so rights should be established.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE as a settlement limit extension due to its poor connectivity and adverse impact on both the townscape and heritage assets.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 07 July 2020



SN2068

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2068
Site address	Cherry Tree Farm, Great Moulton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Residential development – refused pre-1974
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.86 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	16 dwellings and 3 shops
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	Field access from Woodrow Lane. NCC to confirm if potential access constraints could be overcome.  <b>Highways score</b> - Access with acceptable visibility may be achievable with removal of frontage hedge / trees, carriageway widening & 2.0m footway would be required at site frontage. Woodrow Lane has limited forward visibility at northbound approach to the site Visibility from High Green to Woodrow Rd is constrained. No walking route to the catchment 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>1.9 km walk to primary school (no footpath)</p> <p>Limited employment within 1800m</p> <p>Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops close to 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>		No public house, village hall, pre-school or recreation facilities within 1800m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises that water, electricity and gas available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Identified SW flood risk along adjacent highway which would need to be taken into consideration	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland  Not in agricultural use	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would impact on rural approach to both areas of settlement.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Would represent breakout to west which would impact on existing form and character	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species but the impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No detrimental impact on heritage assets  <b>HES Amber score</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on highway network could be mitigated  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential/agriculture/railway line	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access. NCC to confirm feasibility of achieving visibility close to junction. Any new access would be likely to require significant loss of hedgerow	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential/paddock	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow to highway boundaries. Abuts railway line to east.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow including trees along boundaries	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 but proximity to railway line may introduce contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from highway and junction	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)	Separated from settlement with no footpath provision to access proposed retail use. Amenity of future residential occupiers likely affected by proximity to railway line. Development of site would harm rural approach to both settlements	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>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

#### Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	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?	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Access and footpath improvement - NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	3 retail units proposed	



## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not suitable for development due to detrimental impacts on townscape, landscape and incompatibility with adjoining use. Access constraints which would result in loss of hedgerow. Lack of connectivity to serve proposed retail.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Separated from settlement with no footpath provision to access proposed retail use. Amenity of future residential occupiers likely affected by proximity to railway line. Development of site would harm rural approach to both settlements.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside; no conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified.

### **Achievability**

Additional mitigation would be required due to proximity to railway line.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is **UNREASONABLE** due to the identified detrimental impacts that would result on both the townscape and the landscape, its poor connectivity and potential amenity issues for future residents.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 08 July 2020

## SN0210SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN02102SL
Site address	Long Row, Tibenham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Residential applications refused between 1975 – 2016 2019/1821 – retain commercial barn and c/u of barn to residential - approved
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.27 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 6 dwellings (up to 22 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**

<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	Existing access. NCC to confirm if access constraints can be overcome.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	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	2.7km to Winfarthing primary  Limited employment within 1800m	

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 additional services	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Outside of the proposed fibre installation area	Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is potentially contaminated due to adjoining land uses and this would require consideration if the site is taken forward	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified on adjacent highway	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental landscape impacts on landscape would be limited and could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Between two developed sites and detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species but the impact could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of LB to north east. Technical officer to confirm if the site is considered appropriate to progress.  HES Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if any impact on network can be mitigated.  CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Commercial and agriculture. Issues of compatibility could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development may impact on setting of listed farmhouse to north east	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No access. NCC to confirm if safe access and visibility can be achieved	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Vacant	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Commercial/residential/agriculture. Conflict with commercial activity could be mitigated through layout	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Intermittent hedgerow and trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Several trees within boundary hedgerow. Ditch along boundary with highway	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)	Should be investigated due to adjoining commercial activity	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views along 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)	Remote from core services and lacking connectivity. Development may impact on setting of nearby heritage assets.	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

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter confirming same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	NCC to confirm access improvements	Amber
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?	No	





## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not suitable for development due to remoteness from core services, lack of connectivity and potential impact on setting of heritage assets.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Remote from core services and lacking connectivity. Development may impact on setting of nearby heritage assets.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified.

### **Achievability**

Extent of any contamination should be established.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is UNREASONABLE due to its poor connectivity and the potential impact on heritage assets.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 08 July 2020

## SN2112

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2112
Site address	Back Barn Road, Tibenham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Permission for HV overhead lines in 1970s
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.46ha
Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 18 dwellings (up to 13 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**

<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	Field accesses to north and south. NCC to comment on principle of new road and access constraints  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	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	None identified	

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>		Within 1800m of community hall and public house	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Outside of the proposed fibre installation area	Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified at southern end	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland ALC grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Detrimental landscape impacts could be mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impact on townscape could be mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species but the impact could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of LB to north east. Technical officer to confirm if the site is considered appropriate to progress  <b>HES score</b> Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if any impact on network can be mitigated.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture and residential	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development at northern end may impact on setting of LB to east.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm if safe access and visibility can be achieved	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential/agriculture.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open to wider farmland and highways. PROW along eastern boundary.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees/hedgerow and northern and southern would be impacted by new accesses	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)	O/H lines and TPs along southern and eastern boundaries	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views along both roads and in wider views from west and east	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)	Remote from some core services and lacking connectivity. Development would have significant impacts on landscape, townscape and capacity of local network.	Red

## Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Conclusion	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 – multiple	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No but received enquiries	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)	Statement from promoter advising that enquiry received from Saffron	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	NCC to confirm access improvements	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes but no evidence submitted and promoter unsure of potential abnormal costs	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Yes. Road to create new link within settlement	



## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not suitable for development due to remoteness from some core services, lack of connectivity and potential impacts on landscape and townscape.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Remote from some core services and lacking connectivity. Development would have significant impacts on landscape, townscape and capacity of local network.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

### **Achievability**

Promoter advise that Saffron in support but no evidence submitted.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** due to its unsustainable location and poor connectivity. Development of the site would also have an adverse impact on the local landscape and townscape.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 09 July 2020

## SN2118

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2118
Site address	South of Sneath Road, Aslacton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Refusal of residential development under 1980/2914, 1981/0225, 1986/2085, 1987/2085  CoU to playing field – refusal under 1987/1925
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.54 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (aa) Allocated site (bb) SL extension	Allocated <i>(although promoted for a lower number of dwellings)</i>
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 18.5 dph  (Promoted for 8- 10 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	Green	No formal access. Potential access constraints could be overcome through development.  <b>Highways score – Amber</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <b>Part 1:</b> <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	2.3 km walk to primary school (no footpath)  Limited employment within 1800m  Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops 500 m from 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 public house, village hall, pre-school or recreation facilities within 1800m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Area of identified flood risk across significant part of site.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland ALC grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development could be prominent but could be mitigated	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Development would reflect existing form and character. Detrimental impacts could be mitigated  <b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer</b> – Green. 8-10 dwellings would fit in with the neighbourhood grain.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species but the impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No detrimental impact on heritage assets  <b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer</b> - Green  <b>HES</b> Amber score	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Any potential impact on highway network could be reasonably mitigated. NCC to confirm.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No formal access. NCC to confirm if individual accesses are feasible near junction	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and hedgerow to north and east. Southern boundary open to larger parcel of farmland	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Boundary trees to be assessed	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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views from south and site prominent in views at road junction	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 as promoted would reflect existing form and character of settlement and some impacts could be reasonably mitigated. However, appears to be overriding flood risk constraints – technical officer to confirm. Remote from some services.	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>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

#### Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green



<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Access improvement - NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site would be suitable for development in townscape terms, subject to mitigation of impacts. However, appears to be significant flood risk constraints which would reduce developable area.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Development as promoted would reflect existing form and character of settlement and some impacts could be reasonably mitigated. However, appears to be overriding flood risk constraints – technical officer to confirm. Remote from some services.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside; no conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified.

### **Achievability**

No additional constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site would be considered as a **REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE IF THE FLOOD RISK CAN BE MITIGATED**. Due to the identified constraints it is unlikely that the site would be considered as an allocation due to the low number of dwellings likely to be achievable therefore considered as a settlement limit extension.

### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 26 June 2020

SN3008REV

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3008REV
Site address	East of Pristow Green Lane, Tibenham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (cc) Allocated site (dd) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dwellings (up to 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**

<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	Existing field access onto narrow lane. NCC to advise on impact on local network and whether safe access achievable  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	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	No part 1 services within required distance	

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>		Within 1800m of community hall and public house	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, main sewer and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		No data on map for this location	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified along adjacent highway and would need to be taken into consideration  <b>LLFA Score</b> – Green (standard planning information required)	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		E2: Great Moulton Plateau Farmland  ALC grade 3	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Detrimental landscape impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Amber	<p>Detrimental impact on townscape unlikely to be mitigated but could be limited by reduction in site area</p> <p><b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer</b> – Green (depending on the number of units proposed). This seems a very small site – difficult diagonal field boundary. More suitable for replacement dwelling/s – 2-3 units as most if keeping existing neighbourhood grain of development. The existing context bungalows have a larger footprint therefore there is a smaller potential for no of dwellings.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species but the impact could be mitigated</p> <p><b>NCC Ecology score</b> – Green. SSSI/IRZ – potential for protected species/ habitats and biodiversity net gain</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Impact on setting of LB to south west could be mitigated</p> <p><b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer</b> – Green</p> <p><b>HES score</b> - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>NCC to confirm if any impact on network can be mitigated</p> <p><b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture and residential	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Impact on setting of LB to south west could be mitigated through design	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm if safe access and visibility can be achieved on this narrow lane	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential/community hall	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open to larger parcel of farmland to east. Hedgerow to western boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow to western boundary only	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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views along highway and in wider views from south and east	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)	Remote from primary school and lacking connectivity although close to other core services. Development at scale promoted would have detrimental impact on form and character of settlement though could be limited by reduction in site area. Highways view critical to acceptability of site.	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>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

#### Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No but received enquiries	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising that enquiry received from Saffron	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is not suitable for development at scale promoted due to townscape impact. Northern part of site only (approx. 0.5 ha) may be suitable for up to 15 dwellings despite remoteness from cluster primary and subject to satisfactory highways impacts.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Remote from primary and lacking connectivity although close to other core services. Development at scale promoted would have detrimental impact on form and character of settlement though could be limited by reduction in site area. Highways view critical to acceptability of site.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside; no conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

### **Achievability**

Promoter advises expression of interest from Saffron in support, but no evidence submitted

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

UNREASONABLE – due to the townscape impact of development at this scale in this location, as well as the poor connectivity of the site.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 10 July 2020

SN5048

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5048
Site address	Land east of Woodrow Lane, Great Moulton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.5
Promoted Site Use, including (ee) Allocated site (ff) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	None 12-13 @ 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**

<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	Via existing dwelling by demolishing garage and outbuildings.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Safe access not achievable. Remote from services, no footway available to catchment school, local network not of suitable standard.	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>	Amber	2,100m walk to primary school (no footpath)  Limited employment within 1800m  Limited bus service between Norwich – Diss (including peak). Bus stops 100m from site	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	No public house, village hall, pre-school or recreation facilities within 1800m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green	Same as for existing dwelling.  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	None identified. Flood Zone 1.  <b>LLFA:</b> Amber. No surface water flood risk. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green	Green

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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	E2 – Great Moulton Plateau Farmland  Agricultural Land Classification; 3 Good to moderate (Green)	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	It would not have a significant impact on the wider landscape but there would be concern about the loss of mature trees as they are a positive contribution to the general landscape character in this area.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	It would not enhance the townscape although it would not be widely visible outside the site because it is behind existing development. There are several large, detached properties with very large rear gardens which have been specifically excluded from the development boundary to preserve the character of the area. Developing this site would be out of character with the form of development in this part of Woodrow Lane.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	There is existing beneficial habitat as a large garden area and new development may have a negative impact particularly interrupting the north-south corridor for wildlife movement adjacent to the railway.  <b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. SSSI IRZ but housing not listed - discharge of more than 5m <sup>3</sup> /day to ground requires Natural England consultation. Ponds within 250m - amber risk zone for great crested newts. Not in Green Infrastructure Corridor.  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets.  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Connected via access onto Woodrow Lane which runs through the villages and does have a bus route.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Safe access not achievable. Remote from services, no footway available to catchment school, local network not of suitable standard.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Residential dwellings and gardens.</p> <p>Railway line to east boundary.</p>	Green



#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated Sept 2009 and Google Earth 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No nearby assets, not in a conservation area. An additional access would intensify the development at this point where the dwellings are large and well-spaced out with large curtilages.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	There is an existing access serving the single detached dwelling. It is on the outside of the bend, Highway Authority would need to clarify if visibility is adequate for additional development.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential; large dwelling and garden to rear. Would need to demolish garage and outbuildings, presumably necessitating a new garage.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential. Large gardens which are characteristic of this area. Would mean loss of trees which have amenity value.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature boundaries – trees.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Mature boundaries – trees.	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 of contamination, unlikely as it is residential curtilage.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated Sept 2009 and Google Earth 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited public views as this is a rear garden behind existing large dwellings and mature trees. May be views from the railway line to rear (east).	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>The proposal appears out-of-character with the area and contrived by building behind the large dwellings via an access between. It would mean the loss of a large garden area and could set an undesirable precedent for the future.</p> <p>An access for a significant number of dwellings past the side of the existing house would have an unacceptable impact on the existing residential amenity. It would appear cramped. In addition, development would put pressure on existing trees now and in the future.</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)
Conclusion	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	No indication	Red
Comments:	No information given	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)	Unlikely given size and location to rear of dwellings.	Red
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No information given	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site would represent a breakout to the rear of an established line to the rear of dwellings, and although visibility from the highway would be limited, it would be detrimental to the townscape of the area. The site would potentially set an undesirable precedent which could affect a number of mature trees in established gardens. Whilst the site is adjacent to the existing development, it is at the limit in terms of acceptable distances to services, and the highway authority do not consider that a safe access for additional development can be achieved.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The proposal appears out-of-character with the area and contrived by building behind the large dwellings via an access between. It would mean the loss of a large garden area and could set an undesirable precedent for the future.

An access for a significant number of dwellings past the side of the existing house would have an unacceptable impact on the existing residential amenity. It would appear cramped. In addition, development would put pressure on existing trees now and in the future.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

### **Availability**

The site promoter has not given any indication on the timing of the availability of the site.

### **Achievability**

No information provided to support the deliverability of site provided

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Despite being adjacent to the existing Development Boundary, the site is at the limit in terms of acceptable distances to services and the highway authority has questioned the ability to achieve a safe access. The site would also be out of keeping in townscape terms, setting an undesirable precedent for other large mature gardens in the immediate vicinity.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022