



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Site Assessments

Barford, Marlingford, Colton and
Wrampingham

Contents

SN0416	3
SN0424	11
SN0425	19
SN0474	28
SN0475REVA	37
SN0475REVB	45
SN0552	54
SN0552REVA	63
SN0552REVC	72
SN0552REVD	81
SN1013REV.....	90
SN5014	99
SN5015	108

SN0416

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0416
Site address	Land south of Barford Church and north of Barnham Broom Road, Barford
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary b- unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusal for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.21 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Both (The site has been promoted for residential development with an area of open space south of the church – 8 dwellings has been suggested by the site promoter although the site is large enough to accommodate an allocation of 12 or more dwellings and could therefore be considered for either a SL extension or an allocation)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 30 dwellings at 25 dph 6dph at 8 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Constrained access options from the church or off Barnham Broom Road NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. Surrounding highway network is sub-standard and there is no safe walking route to school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities Part 1: ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Distance to Barford Primary School 750 metres but with limited footway provision Bus route passes site Local employment in village 950km from site	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Barford village hall and recreation area 600 metres Distance to The Cock public house (currently closed) 790 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	The promoter is unsure if mains water, sewerage and electricity are available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION – Green	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B6 Yare Tributary Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Although not in an identified river valley landscape the site is in a prominent elevated position. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Site would have poor relationship with existing pattern of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Sites to north in Yare valley	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II* Church of St Botolph to north NCC HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Rural roads with no footways in close proximity NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. Surrounding highway network is sub-standard and there is no safe walking route to school	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential, agricultural and place of worship	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site forms important role in setting of church which development would affect greatly.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be achieved off Barnham Broom Road though this would require speed limit restrictions to be extended as it is currently a rural road within the open countryside. Access by the church is highly constrained.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land, no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to east, church to north and agricultural to south and west. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Sections of hedging and trees on southern boundary. Eastern boundary is domestic fences and evergreen hedging. Western boundary is undefined as part of same field	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant tree in north-eastern corner of site. Further large tree on southern boundary has sustained recent serious storm damage. Other potential habitat limited to small sections of hedging and 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)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Barnham Broom Road and permissive footpath that runs alongside it. Site is prominent within the landscape due to its elevated position.	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not considered appropriate to allocate as development of this site would be detrimental to the wider landscape and to the setting of the church. Also has potential access and connectivity constraints.	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	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	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)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Footway provision may be required; open space and/or landscaping to protect the setting of the Church	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any recent evidence of viability (a 2016 letter from an affordable housing provider was submitted at the time the site was originally promoted)	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Green/ open space suggested	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated although it has been promoted for a smaller number of dwellings (of a settlement limit extension scale) to include open space south of the Church. The site is removed from the existing settlement boundary and would not be a logical extension of the existing settlement limit. Constraints noted relating to the proximity to the designated heritage asset, as well as potential access constraints.

Site Visit Observations

The site is in a prominent location and development would have a significant impact on the local landscape, in particular on views to the church whose setting would be harmed, even if an area of open space is incorporated adjacent to the Church. Potential connectivity issues due to the lack of footways have also been identified.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting designations however the site is removed from the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is **UNREASONABLE** and is considered to be unsuitable as either an allocation or an extension to the existing settlement limit. Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed Church immediately to the north of the site. The inclusion of an area of open space to the south of the Church is not considered sufficient to overcome this impact and would reduce the developable area of the site. The site is removed from the existing settlement limit and has connectivity issues and is therefore also not considered to be suitable as a settlement limit extension.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 22 October 2020

SN0424

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0424
Site address	Land south of Marlingford Road, Colton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history other than approval for the affordable dwellings which the site surrounds (2012/0639)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.75 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	The site has been promoted for 16 dwellings – 21dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential for suitable access to site is severely constrained due to nature of local road network</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red.</p> <p>The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.</p>	Red
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Distance to Barford Primary School 2.4km along mainly narrow country lanes</p> <p>Distance to bus stop in Barford or to north more than 1.8km</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Colton village hall and play area 810 metres Distance to Norfolk Lurcher public house 1.2km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water supply and sewerage network capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter is unsure if mains water, sewerage and electricity are provided	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Information not available	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A2 Yare / Tiffey Rural River Valley / G1 Easton Fringe Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Part of site is in a designated river valley. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Green	No estate type development in the settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is highly constrained with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of site would result in a form of character that does not relate well to the existing form and character of Colton	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access to the site is promoted from Marlingford Road, although it could also be achieved from Barford Road. Both are highly constrained with little potential for adequate improvements	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential uses along Marlingford Road. Other adjoining land is in agricultural use. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Southern and eastern boundary is undefined as part of larger field. No boundary treatment on western boundary with Barford Road.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Limited habitat due to lack of vegetation on the site other than recently planted trees / hedging on Marlingford Road	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Barford Road to Marlingford Road	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site not considered suitable for allocation or inclusion within the settlement limit as it will introduce a form of development into an area that it is not characteristic and intrude into open countryside. The local road network is also highly constrained	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)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site falls partly within River Valley designation	Amber

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	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)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Local highway improvements would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any recent evidence of viability (A supporting letter from an affordable housing provider was submitted in 2016)	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for a small allocation. Potential access constraints and local road network constraints have been identified but no other significant constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

The site is prominent in an open landscape, particularly on approach to the village from south. The existing character of the village is loose frontage development along the road, retaining a rural character. The existing road network is very constrained.

Local Plan Designations

The site is outside and removed from the development boundary. The site is also partly within the river valley landscape designation.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be unsuitable for allocation and is therefore UNREASONABLE. It is located in a prominent location within the landscape and would have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of Colton, particularly when approaching from the south. The local road network is also noted to have considerable constraints which can not be overcome.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 22 October 2020

SN0425

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0425
Site address	Land at Mill Road and Barford Road, Marlingford
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals of individual dwellings
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.86 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – five dwellings (The site has been promoted for 5 dwellings only and as a SL extension although it would be large enough to accommodate a greater number of dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	5 dph at 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

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Possibility of creating suitable access is severely constrained</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access may be achievable but would require carriageway widening to 5.5m & 2.0m wide footway at the site frontage, hedges and trees likely to require removal. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.</p>	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"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	Distance to Barford Primary School 2.3km, mainly along rural road with no footway	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to Marlingford village hall and cricket ground 220 metres</p> <p>Marlingford Bell public house less than 100 metres</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water recycling centre capacity to be checked	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but not sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Significant parts of site are in Flood Zone 2	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A2 Yare / Tiffey Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is designated river valley. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Little existing development on southern side of Barford Road or northern side of Mill Road	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	County Wildlife Site to east, but intervening residential development	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed buildings on opposite side of Barford Road NCC HES – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is highly constrained with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access may be achievable but would require carriageway widening to 5.5m & 2.0m wide footway at the site frontage, hedges and trees likely to require removal. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and woodland	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would not relate well to the existing linear pattern of development along the southern side of Mill Road and northern side of Barford Road with open space in between the two roads. Furthermore, development would be likely to have an adverse impact on the setting of the listed building on the northern side of Barford Road	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	An access could potentially be achieved onto either road, albeit with the loss of some hedgerow.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Meadow land, no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties on opposite sides of both roads with meadow land and woodland either side of the site in between the two roads. No compatibility issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and hedgerows along highway boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Meadow including grassland and access to water features could provide habitat along with hedgerows and 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)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site possible along both Mill Road and Barford Road but limited by hedging and trees	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not recommended for allocation due to the site's separation from services, the adverse impact development would have in this location as well impact on nearby designated 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)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	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)	Supporting form from promoter.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highway works likely to be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Due to site constraints the site has been promoted for 5 dwellings – therefore below the affordable housing threshold	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size of a settlement limit extension or potentially a small allocation however large parts of the site are within Flood Zone 2. The site is poorly related to existing services and is within a sensitive river valley setting.

Site Visit Observations

An area of meadow land that forms part of the undeveloped sides of Mill Road and Barford Road and contributes to the setting of the listed building. The site potentially has ecological value which would be lost if developed. Access constraints have also been identified.

Local Plan Designations

The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is **UNREASONABLE** as both an allocation and an extension to the existing settlement limit. Development of the site would conflict with the linear pattern of development in evidence, eroding the character of the settlement. The site relates poorly to the existing services, including the local school. The site is also within a sensitive River Valley setting and furthermore, access constraints to the site have also been identified.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 29 October 2020

SN0474

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0474
Site address	Land west of Colton Road, Marlingford
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Various applications relating for former quarry use
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.15 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocation for residential – numbers not specified, could be holiday accommodation or staff accommodation linked to Barnham Broom Golf Club
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	53 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access options constrained by nature of local highway network NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access achievable with removal of frontage hedges/trees to provide adequate visibility, along with the required c/w widening and frontage footway. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	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"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Distance to Barford Primary School 2km mainly along rural roads with no footways</p> <p>Distance to bus service 640 metres</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to Marlingford village hall and cricket ground and Colton village hall and recreation area both 1.7km</p> <p>Distance to Marlingford Bell public house 1.4km</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water supply and water recycling centre likely to be needed to be upgraded	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		No planned upgrade to fibre technology	Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Previous use of site for mineral extraction	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Site contains several areas at risk of surface water flooding	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Fringe Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		G1 Easton Fringe Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development will introduce urban development into an area of open landscape to its detriment. Some parts of site are in high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would be detached from main parts of settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Site is adjacent to ancient woodland	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access achievable with removal of frontage hedges/trees to provide adequate visibility, along with the required c/w widening and frontage footway. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential, agricultural and woodland	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would be detached development with no relationship to the existing main parts of the settlement	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access onto public highway would require the removal of extensive vegetation. Road is also highly constrained which NCC Highways note is not suitable for development	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Field, not clear if in agricultural use. Possible issues from former quarry use on part of site	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to south. Agricultural land to north, east and west. Woodland to south-west. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Some level differences within site	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Belt of trees along highway boundary. Trees and hedging along other boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging. Also adjacent to ancient woodland with other habitat to south-west	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)	Some potential for contamination from previous mineral extraction use which would need to be investigated further.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site are limited due to boundary treatment, particularly from Colton Road	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is remote from the main parts of the settlement and therefore would be harmful to the landscape and rural character of the area, as well suffering from poor access due to the restricted nature of the local highway 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	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Carriageway widening and footway provision would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site could be reduced in size to be suitable for an allocation of 12 to 25 dwellings.

Site Visit Observations

Site is remote from the main parts of the settlement, accessed by narrow country lanes. Site is well screened.

Local Plan Designations

Outside and detached from any development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Not suitable due to remote location of site and poor access.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 2 December 2020

SN0475REVA

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0475REVA
Site address	Land east of Highhouse Farm Lane, Colton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.77 hectares (Option A)
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for 12 mainly affordable housing)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	15dph
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	Constraints on achieving suitable access due to nature of road network NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. No access from the highway. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. * Not specified if A or B on previous notes	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Barford Primary School 3.3km along rural roads with no footways No bus service within 1.8km	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Colton village hall and play area 850 metres Adjacent to Norfolk Lurcher public house	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewerage network (including the water recycling centre) infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Clarification required that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk LLFA – 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	Fringe Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		G1 Easton Fringe Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site contains high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would not reflect linear frontage development in village	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed buildings to west	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is heavily constrained with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. No access from the highway. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of this site would not relate well to the existing form and character of Colton	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be achieved onto Highhouse Farm Lane, however this is a very constrained rural lane	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land, with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north and agricultural land to south, along with remainder of site (Option B) to east. Public house to north-east of site, however it is unlikely that the issues this raises would prevent development of the site	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Large trees on southern boundary. Hedging and trees on northern boundary. Belt of bushes and trees on highway boundary. Eastern boundary is undefined as part of larger field	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in vegetation on site 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)	Overhead power line crosses western part of site running north-south	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site are limited due to vegetation on highway boundary	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is not recommended for either allocation or settlement limit extension given poor relationship with form and character of existing village, constrained road network and poor access to services	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	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	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)	Supporting form from promoter	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highways improvements likely to be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Public open space and affordable housing above policy requirements	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated but is over 3km from the primary school. Highways issues and access constraints have been identified. Potential landscape issues resulting from possible loss of existing trees and hedgerows.

Site Visit Observations

The site is poorly connected and is remote from existing services; it is also in conflict with the existing linear form of development along Norwich Road. Highhouse Farm Lane is a narrow rural lane.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside the development boundary, although is within relatively close proximity.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** and is not suitable for allocation. The benefits of an affordable housing led scheme are outweighed by the poor connectivity of the site, including its distance from the local primary school, as well as the impact development of the site would have on the existing form and character of the settlement. Significant highways network and access constraints have also been identified.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 2 December 2020

SN0475REVB

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0475B
Site address	Land east of Highhouse Farm Lane, Colton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.97 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for 12 mainly affordable housing)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12 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	Constraints on achieving suitable access due to nature of road network and need to cross neighbouring land (option A) NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Does not appear to be accessible from the highway. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. (site assumed adjacent to SN0475REVA)	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	<p>Distance to Barford Primary School 3.3km along rural roads with no footways</p> <p>No bus service within 1.8km</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to Colton village hall and play area 850 metres</p> <p>Adjacent to Norfolk Lurcher public house</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	<p>Sewerage network (including the water recycling centre) capacity to be confirmed</p> <p>AW advise sewers crossing the site</p>	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Clarification required that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk LLFA – 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	Fringe Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		G1 Easton Fringe Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site contains high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would not reflect linear frontage development in village	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed buildings to west	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local road network is heavily constrained with no footways</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS - Does not appear to be accessible from the highway. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. (site assumed adjacent to SN0475REVA)</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of this site would not relate well to the existing form and character of Colton and would also have long access from the road	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be achieved onto Highhouse Farm Lane across option A, however this is a very constrained rural lane	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land, with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north and agricultural land to south. Public house to north-east of site, however it is unlikely that the issues this raises would prevent development of the site	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Large trees on southern boundary. Hedging and trees on northern boundary. Western boundary is undefined as part of larger field	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in vegetation on site 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)	Overhead power line crosses western part of site running north-south	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site are limited due to vegetation on highway boundary	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is not recommended for either allocation or settlement limit extension given poor relationship with form and character of existing village, constrained road network and poor access to services	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	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	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)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highways improvement works likely to be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Public open space and affordable housing above policy requirements	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated but over 3km from school. Potential severe access and highway network constraints identified. The site does not appear to relate well to the existing form of development within Colton.

Site Visit Observations

The site is poorly connected and is remote from existing services; it is also in conflict with the existing linear form of development along Norwich Road. Highhouse Farm Lane is a narrow rural lane. Access to the site would need to be across adjacent land (option A).

Local Plan Designations

Site outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** and is not suitable for inclusion as an allocation. The site relates poorly to the existing services, including the primary school, and would have a poor relationship with the existing form and character of the settlement. Significant access and highway network constraints have also been identified and are considered to be further barriers to the development of this site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 2 December 2020

SN0552

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0552
Site address	Land off Watton Road, Barford
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development to south of B1108
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	36.54 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for a 29ha country park and 150 dwellings with the developable area approximately 7.54 ha)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	19dph (based upon the above developable area)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	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	Constraints on where access can be delivered NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to being able to provide a junction with 2.4 x 120m visibility in both direction, which may require third party land, a safe pedestrian crossing on the B1108, assessment of the village speed limit and localised footway improvements where possible to provide a 2.0m footway, development likely to be considered acceptable.	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"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Distance to Barford Primary School between 500 metres and 1km from site</p> <p>Bus service runs past site along B1108</p> <p>Local employment on opposite side of B1108 to southern part of site</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to Barford village hall and recreation area between 300 metres and 800 metres</p> <p>The Cock public house (currently closed) is adjacent to the site</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	<p>Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed</p> <p>AW advise sewers crossing the site</p>	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>No known contamination or ground stability issues</p> <p>NCC MINERALS & WASTE – This site is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site goes forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p> <p>NATIONAL GRID – Green. Note this site would be affected by the Transmission Line Route ‘Norwich Main – Walpole 1’ [no objection is raised]</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION – Green.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface and fluvial flood risk on large areas of southern part of site plus along B1108 on northern 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	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Site is within identified river valley. No loss of high grade agricultural land.</p> <p>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER – This site forms a natural corridor and ecological constraints may be problematic. There are long views back across the site.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of either part of the site would not relate directly to the existing pattern of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Site to east	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Site surrounds Grade II listed building on B1108. Also affects setting of non-designated heritage assets such as the Cock public house</p> <p>NCC HES – Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Cock Lane is a narrow constrained lane whilst there is a lack of footways along the B1108</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to being able to provide a junction with 2.4 x 120m visibility in both direction, which may require third party land, a safe pedestrian crossing on the B1108, assessment of the village speed limit and localised footway improvements where possible to provide a 2.0m footway, development likely to be considered acceptable.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Largely agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Potential adverse impact on designated and non-designated heritage assets depending on which part of the site is developed. However, whether developing the northern part of the site or the southern section it is detached from the main part of the settlement, particularly when considering that the part of the site that best relates to the village is the area most at risk of flooding.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential for access varies on which part of site is to be developed, however highways have indicated that access could be achievable but is likely to require improvements to pedestrian facilities	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Largely agricultural use with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Two sets of residential properties surrounded by site. Public house (currently closed) and commercial units to north of site that would need to be taken into account in any residential scheme. Agricultural land to south and west, meadow land around River Tiffey to east.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Southern part of site largely level, northern part of site rising out of valley floor	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries of northern part of site with B1108 and Cock Lane are open. Hedging on parts of southern part site that bound B1108. South-western boundary of southern part of site undefined as forms part of large field	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees and hedging on boundaries provide habitat. Close to river and some ponds	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overheard power lines on southern part 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 across northern part of site both from B1108 and Cock Street. Development on northern part of site would be prominent in river valley landscape. Some views possible from Wrampingham across the river valley to the south.	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable for development. Much of the site is detached from the main settlement and its development would have a considerable landscape impact. Those areas of the site that have the strongest relationship to the existing village are those that are at greatest risk of flooding.	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)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site falls within River Valley designation	Amber

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Various highways improvements would be required . Flood issues would also required resolution/ mitigation.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Major new public park proposed (28.94 hectares)	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

As promoted the site is of an excessive size however it could be reduced to a size suitable for an allocation of 25 dwellings. Significant areas of flood risk have been identified across the site, as well as nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets. There is a County Wildlife Site to the east of the site. Whilst highways constraints have been identified it may be possible to overcome these with various agreed highways works.

Site Visit Observations

This is a large site comprising of a number of elements, however it is mainly divided between a large open field to north of B1108 and parts of fields around existing clusters of buildings to the south of B1108. Parts of the site are quite prominent in views and development of these areas would have a potential adverse impact on the designated River Valley landscape. Development of the site would not result in a strong relationship with the main existing parts of the village.

Local Plan Designations

River Valley landscape designation.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** for allocation, either as promoted or at a reduced scale to meet the objectives of the Plan. As promoted the site is excessive in scale and would have a significant adverse impact on the wider landscape. A site of reduced size would be more appropriate however it would continue to have an adverse landscape impact and due to the identified flood risk constraints on those parts of the site closest to the existing settlement new development would have a poor relationship with the main village. It may be possible to overcome the identified highways concerns through various highways mitigation measures.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 29 October 2020

SN0552REVA

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0552REVA
Site address	Land at Bridge Road and Watton Road, Barford
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	1988/3195 for 1 dwelling refused 27/10/1988.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.12
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25 or more 53 at 25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Existing access is via Suttons Loke, minor road, to the west. Has frontage to B1108 – would need to check with HA if safe access can be achieved in 40mph area. However, would require loss of significant hedge in a very prominent position.</p> <p>Highways meeting (from discussion of the wider SN0552 site) - the site is the wrong side of the B1108 and would potentially require a pedestrian crossing as well as demonstrating adequate visibility within the 40mph area. Development (of a larger site) could help enforce speed reduction through 'side friction'.</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"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	<p>Barford Primary School; 560 metres</p> <p>Bus service runs past site along B1108 – stops within 100m</p> <p>Local employment on opposite side of B1108 – within 50m</p>	N/A
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	<p>Barford village hall and recreation area; 440 metres</p> <p>(Cock public house, adjacent to the west of the site is closed)</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	No known constraints.	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Owner states that water, sewer and electricity are in place along Suttons Loke, but no mains gas.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Under consideration for further upgrades.	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	<p>No information given.</p> <p>Contamination unlikely as grazing area.</p> <p>Stability questionable given flood risk, would need further information.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Red	Area to the east, adjacent to the River is in Flood Zones 2 and 3. High risk of surface water flooding in patches over the whole site as low-lying.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Red	Site is within identified River Valley. Wide view of site when approaching from east on B1108. Significant residential development would appear incongruous.	Red
Townscape	Green	No impact on townscape but it would not follow the existing pattern of development which is to the north of the B1108.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Red	Adjacent to river – habitat value. Pond on site. Would need further investigation.	Red
Historic Environment	Green	Doesn't affect setting of non-designated heritage asset, the Cock public house.	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Adjacent to the B1108 which is the main Watton Road from Norwich and connects directly to the A47 at Colney. On bus route. Well connected.</p> <p>Highways meeting (from discussion of the wider SN0552 site) - the site is the wrong side of the B1108 and would potentially require a pedestrian crossing as well as demonstrating adequate visibility within the 40mph area. Development (of a larger site) could help enforce speed reduction through 'side friction'.</p>	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>To the west off Suttons Loke is residential. To the north, opposite alongside (B1108) is mostly industrial, as well as Barford Vehicle Hire also residential on Style Loke and more residential down to the River. To the east is the River Tiffey and lower land. To the south is farmland recently planted as wildflowers and various field shelters and storage.</p> <p>Uses are compatible but concern about proximity to River.</p>	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2019)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	None.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is currently from Sutton Loke which is a narrow track to the west off the B1108. Would need to consider whether direct access from B1108 was preferable.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Grazing for horse.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential on Sutton Loke, commercial and residential to north on B1108 and grazing land/river to south and east. Compatible uses.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level and flat, adjacent to River Tiffey and low-lying, need to check flooding.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Narrow path, verge and significant native, mature hedge with Ash tree to road frontage. Also historic mileage stone; '7 miles to Norwich'. Significant mature hedge along Loke boundary. River to east and field boundary to south.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Yes, significant hedges on two boundaries and the River to the east. Likely to be important habitat, would need ecology investigation.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on/ adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Electricity power cables cross the site; four poles along frontage. No evidence of contamination, unlikely as only appears to be used for grazing.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2019)	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	<p>Significant views into site from main road particularly from east as the river valley is flat and undeveloped and the road level rises over the Tiffey.</p> <p>There is a hedge on frontage and to the west but dwellings would still be highly visible above this.</p> <p>Views out of the site would be wide to the south as the land is flat and open.</p>	N/A
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	<p>Development in Barford is largely to north of B1108 with only sporadic development to south and none between Suttons Loke and Burdock Lane. This is an important part of the setting of the River and development would be very intrusive in the landscape.</p> <p>Also risk of flooding both from river and surface water.</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)
River Valley		N/A
Conclusion	Site falls within River Valley designation	Amber

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate) Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	6-10 years	Red
Comments:	Not within required timescale.	N/A

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Whilst the site is well located in terms of distance to services, these services are to the north of the B1108 and the highway authority has indicated that a crossing point would be necessary. The highways authority is also concerned re the ability to achieve the visibility necessary within the 40mph zone.

The principal concerns with the site are the extent of flood risk across the site (both fluvial and surface water) and the impact of developing a field south of the B1108, where development is sporadic and loose knit, and most of the settlement is to the north of the road. The impact on the river valley landscape is likely to be heightened by the need to create sufficient frontage visibility to access the site.

Site Visit Observations

Development in Barford is largely to north of B1108 with only sporadic development to south and none between Suttons Loke and Burdock Lane. This is an important part of the setting of the River and development would be very intrusive in the landscape.

Also risk of flooding both from river and surface water.

Local Plan Designations

River Valley landscape and open countryside.

Availability

The site promoter has indicated the site will be available in the medium term (6 to 10 years)

Achievability

The site promoter has indicated the site is deliverable, but not submitted any evidence to support this.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Whilst the site is well located in terms of distance to services, these services are to the north of the B1108. The main concerns with the site relate to the extensive flood risk (both fluvial and surface water), the impact of developing this site within the rural River Valley, which is particularly evident when approaching from the east and would be heightened by any removal of vegetation to create suitable visibility; and the need to provide a safe crossing point to the main part of the village to the north of the B1108..

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 28/04/2022

SN0552REVC

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0552REVC
Site address	Land at Watton Road, Barford
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.73ha (residential element)
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25 dwellings and 6ha of open space
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>The site has two road frontages where the residential development is proposed. An indicative plan shows a site access off the B1108 Watton Road or off Back Lane.</p> <p>Back Lane is a single carriageway road and currently unsuitable.</p> <p>Highways meeting (from discussion of the wider SN0552 site) – site would need to demonstrate adequate visibility within the 40mph area. Development (of a larger site) could help enforce speed reduction through 'side friction'.</p>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Barford Primary School; 400 metres from site</p> <p>Bus service runs past site along B1108 (bus stops approx. 275m)</p> <p>Local employment on B1108 (approx. 350m)</p>	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	Distance to Barford village hall and recreation area; 520 metres (Cock public house, close to the site is closed)	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known capacity issues.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Within village on east side. No gas – oil only?	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely as agricultural field.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1 Low risk if surface water flooding to south along the B1108.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Outside of the river valley designation but this field is open and prominent on the approach from the west. Development would break out into the countryside and be highly visible.	Red
Townscape	Red	Doesn't relate well to the existing village. This site is away from the village core, in an area where houses are only sporadic. Back Lane currently provides a clearly defined the edge of the settlement and this site breaches that line.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Unlikely to be any habitat as it is an arable field with open boundaries on all sides.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed farmhouse opposite the rural setting of which would be affected.	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Direct access onto B1108 and onward to the A47 and Norwich. However, there is a lack of footway access back to the village, and no indication that one could be provided.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture and sparse detached dwellings.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site has services within walking distance and is well connected to Norwich. But it is detached from the main part of the settlement and would negatively impact on the landscape. The affect on the listed building will need to be considered.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Two possible accesses are suggested. Back Lane is a very minor, single track road although it could be widened to a site access. It is likely that an access could be achieved from the B1108.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Arable field.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture with scattered houses opposite and one set well back on Back Lane.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Slope down towards the village.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	None – open with a small bank along each roadside.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No	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)	Telegraph poles along B1108. Unlikely to be contaminated given agricultural use.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Long views into and out of the site when approaching from north and west.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development would have a significant impact on the landscape and would not respect the existing character of the village.	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)
Adjacent River Valley		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No. Would need to demonstrate how open space would be provided, managed etc in addition to residential.	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	6ha open space	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is on the western periphery of Barford, where Back Lane currently forms an edge to the settlement. Whilst within a reasonable distance of local services and bus stops on the main Norwich/Watton route, there is a lack of footway connections along the busy B1108 (which is subject to a 40mph limit); the site would need to demonstrate adequate visibility in both directions onto the B1108. Barford is currently visually well contained in the landscape; however, this site would be visible for some considerable distance when approaching from the west, changing the character of the area. There would also be impacts on the rural outlook of the listed Sayers Farm.

Site Visit Observations

Development would have a significant impact on the landscape and would not respect the existing character of the village.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability

The site promoter has indicated the site would be available within the first five years of the plan.

Achievability

The site promoter has indicated the site is deliverable. However, no supporting evidence has been provided to support deliverability, in particular the extensive areas of open space offered as part of the scheme.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Whilst the site is relatively well located in terms of distance to services and has few on-site constraints there are two main concerns with development in this location (1) the visual intrusion which would make the settlement of Barford more prominent, as opposed to presently being visually well contained, significantly altering the character of the area and impacting on the rural setting of the listed Sayers Farm; and (2) the lack of safe pedestrian (and cycle) links back to the main part of the village. On balance, as a relatively small extension to the settlement, a proposal with adequate landscaping/screening, a sensitive layout/design and suitable access on to the B1108 and good quality pedestrian links into the main part of the village could be acceptable.

UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR FOCUSED REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION:

The site would be contingent on the delivery of the site east of Back Lane (SN0552REVB) in order for highway access to be achievable. As the site opposite is already considered to be a preferred site and was included in the Regulation 19 version of the VCHAP, it is considered that it would be possible to deliver this site either alongside or after the development of SN0552REVB (Policy VC BAR1).

The site is exposed to the open countryside and contributes towards the setting of the Sayers Farmhouse Listed Building. Significant consideration will need to be given to these factors during the design phase to ensure the impacts are mitigated as much as possible whilst also balancing the need

to deliver new homes in the area. The site is considered for development of up to 20 dwellings, which would allow for the delivery of appropriate landscaping and screening to mitigate the impacts on the landscape and townscape. Landscaping and screening will also be needed to mitigate the impacts on the setting of Sayers Farmhouse.

UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR REGULATION 19 ADDENDUM:

During the Focused Regulation 18 Consultation, heritage concerns were raised by Historic England over the impact development on this site would have on the Listed Sayers Farmhouse opposite the site. Whilst concerns were raised in the Heritage Impact Assessment, which was prepared to support the consultation, Historic England went further and advised that this site should not be allocated. Due to these concerns, the Council does not consider the site to be suitable for allocation.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 29/04/2022

SN0552REVD

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0552REVD
Site address	Land at Watton Road, Barford
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.97Ha (residential element only)
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	50 dwellings and 12ha of open space
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>The site has two road frontages where the residential development is proposed. An indicative plan shows two site accesses off the B1108 Watton Road and one off Back Lane.</p> <p>Back Lane is a single carriageway road and currently unsuitable.</p> <p>Highways meeting (from discussion of the wider SN0552 site) – site would need to demonstrate adequate visibility within the 40mph area. Development (of a larger site) could help enforce speed reduction through 'side friction'.</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"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Barford Primary School; 400 metres from site</p> <p>Bus service runs past site along B1108 (bus stops approx. 275m)</p> <p>Local employment on B1108 (approx. 350m)</p>	N/A
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	<p>Distance to Barford village hall and recreation area; 520 metres</p> <p>(Cock public house, opposite the site is closed)</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known capacity issues.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Within village on east side. No gas – oil only?	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely as agricultural field.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood Zone 1</p> <p>Low risk if surface water flooding to south along the B1108.</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	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Outside of the river valley designation but this field is open and prominent on the approach from the west. Development would break out into the countryside and be highly visible particularly on this scale.	Red
Townscape	Red	Doesn't relate well to the existing village. This site is away from the village core, in an area where houses are only sporadic. Back Lane currently provides a clearly defined the edge of the settlement and this site breaches that line. Lengthening the site along the B1108 would also be uncharacteristic of the relatively compact nature of Barford, where only very low-density housing extends beyond the core of the village.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Unlikely to be any habitat as it is an arable field with open boundaries on all sides.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed farmhouse opposite the rural setting of which would be affected.	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Green	Well linked. Direct access onto B1108 and onward to the A47 and Norwich. However, there is a lack of footway access back to the village, and no indication that one could be provided.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture and sparse detached dwellings.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site has services within walking distance and is well connected to Norwich. But it is detached from the main part of the settlement and would negatively impact on the landscape. The effect on the listed building will need to be considered.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Three possible accesses are suggested. Back Lane is a very minor, single track road although it could be widened to a site access. It is likely that access could be achieved from the B1108.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Arable field.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture with scattered houses opposite and one set well back on Back Lane.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Slope down towards the village.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	None – open with a small bank along each roadside.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No	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)	Telegraph poles along B1108. Unlikely to be contaminated given agricultural use.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Long views into and out of the site when approaching from north and west.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development would have a significant impact on the landscape, particularly as it would extend further onto higher ground. It would not respect the existing, compact character of the village by extending development along the B1108.	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)
Adjacent River Valley		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No. Would need to demonstrate how open space would be provided, managed etc in addition to residential.	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	12ha open space	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is on the western periphery of Barford, where Back Lane currently forms an edge to the settlement. Whilst within a reasonable distance of local services and bus stops on the main Norwich/Watton route, there is a lack of footway connections along the busy B1108 (which is subject to a 40mph limit); the site would need to demonstrate adequate visibility in both directions onto the B1108. Barford is currently visually well contained in the landscape; however, this site would be visible for some considerable distance when approaching from the west, significantly changing the character of the area and the form of the settlement, which is currently relatively compact. There would also be impacts on the rural outlook of the listed Sayers Farm.

Site Visit Observations

Development would have a significant impact on the landscape, particularly as it would extend further onto higher ground. It would not respect the existing, compact character of the village by extending development along the B1108.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability

The site promoter has indicated the site would be available within the first five years of the plan.

Achievability

The site promoter has indicated the site is deliverable. However, no supporting evidence has been provided to support deliverability, in particular the extensive areas of open space offered as part of the scheme.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Whilst the site is relatively well located in terms of distance to services and has few on-site constraints there are two main concerns with development in this location: (1) the visual intrusion of a site extending along the B1108 on rising land, which would make the compact settlement of Barford more prominent, as opposed to presently being visually well contained, significantly altering the character of the area and impacting on the rural setting of the listed Sayers Farm; and (2) the lack of safe pedestrian (and cycle) links back to the main part of the village. The site is also of scale that is larger than being sought in the VCHAP, and although the benefit of a substantial area of open space is being offered, there is no indication of engagement with the local community regarding support for this, or how any long-term management would be undertaken.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 29/04/202

SN1013REV

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1013REV
Site address	Land between Church Lane and Back Lane, Barford
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated (land to the north of the site comprises existing allocation BAR1)
Planning History	Refused planning application on allocation (2019/0556) immediately to the north
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for 60 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	30 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	Constrained nature of road makes access difficult to achieve. Access to the site would be via Back Lane or through the existing allocation on Church Lane which has proved to be problematic in highways terms. NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access would require removal of frontage trees & hedges, along with provision of frontage carriageway widening & footway. No safe walking route to school/village facilities.	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"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Distance to Barford Primary School 330 metres via existing allocation – no footway on Church Lane</p> <p>Bus service passes site</p> <p>Local employment 550 metres from site</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to Barford village hall and recreation area 170 metres</p> <p>Distance to The Cock public house (currently closed) 460 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	<p>Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed</p> <p>AW advise sewers crossing the site</p>	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>No known contamination or ground stability issues</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION - Green</p>	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	Surface water flood risk along Church Lane LLFA – Green	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A2 Yare / Tiffey Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would be in designated River Valley landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Would introduce estate development into area of village where this not characteristic	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC Ecology – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is very constrained with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access would require removal of frontage trees & hedges, along with provision of frontage carriageway widening & footway. No safe walking route to school/village facilities.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Would introduce estate development into a part of the village that has a rural loose pattern of development and is positioned away from the main part of the settlement. A site of reduced scale would have a similar impact.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Significant constraints on Church Lane have prevented delivery of the existing allocation. New evidence has been submitted which would need to be considered by the Highway Authority if access were to be considered via Church Lane. Access via Back Lane also appears to be constrained due to the narrow lane.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Existing greenfield site that may have formerly been part of land associated with The Hall	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties on northern side of Church Lane. Large grounds of The Hall to the east. Farm to the west and agricultural land on opposite side of Back Lane to the south. Existing allocation BAR1 immediately to the north. Development should be achievable without compatibility issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Road lower than site	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries are all well vegetated with hedging and trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees within site along with vegetation on the boundaries provide habitat	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on or adjacent to 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 of the site are contained by vegetation on highway boundaries	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	The site is not suitable for allocation due to access issues, as well as estate development of the scale proposed (or at a reduced scale) being out of character with this part of the village	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)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site falls within River Valley designation	Amber

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	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)	Supporting form from promoter. Known highway constraint preventing delivery of current allocation adjacent to the site. The promoter of the site has indicated access would be achievable via BAR1.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Footway provision would be required, although its deliverability is questionable.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided and has provided viability evidence but this would need updating.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site could be reduced in size to be suitable for an allocation of between 12 to 25 dwellings however the site is adjacent to existing allocation BAR1 which has known access constraints. Access via Back Lane would also be subject to the constraints of the existing road network.

Site Visit Observations

The site is in a more rural area of village and has well vegetated boundaries. The existing development pattern is loose in form. Access to the site via Church Lane would be constrained due to the levels difference and Back Lane is also a narrow road.

Local Plan Designations

The site is adjacent to the existing allocation. It is also within a designated River Valley.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, if a suitable access could be provided.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** site for allocation. Principle access is proposed via the existing allocation, BAR1, which has known access constraints. Furthermore, even at a reduced scale/ site size development in this location would have an adverse impact on the existing loose pattern form of development that characterises this part of the village.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 29 October 2020

SN5014

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5014
Site address	Land north of the Norfolk Lurcher/Ugly Bug Inn, Colton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2015/1148/F for swimming pool and residential accommodation refused 20/07/2015, and appeal dismissed 03/06/2016.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.1
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	6 28 at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	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 small field access on Norwich Road, overgrown. NCC Highways – Amber. Access requires significant hedge / tree removal. Site remote, no walking route to catchment school, network poor.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	Distance to Barford Primary School 3,100 m along rural roads with no footways Honningham Thorpe Farms employment complex approx. 350m, plus other local employment in the vicinity.	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	Distance to Colton village hall and play area 850 metres Adjacent to Norfolk Lurcher public house	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known constraints. Environment Agency: Green	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No identified on-site infrastructure.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Half site: available to some or all properties and no upgrade planned via BBfN. Half site: no planned upgrade	Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Greenfield and unlikely to be contaminated. No known issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1 Small areas of Surface Water Flood risk to north and west roadsides and one small area within the site: 1:1000 LLFA: Amber. At risk of surface water flooding. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. Environment Agency: Green	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i> Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	North: East: Fringe Farmland West: Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	North: East: G1 Easton Fringe Farmland West: B6 Yare Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; 2 Very good (Light Blue)	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Landscape impact resulting from possible loss of existing trees and significant hedgerow on frontage.	Amber
Townscape	Red	Surrounding development is sporadic and not intense. Building a number of houses here would not be in keeping with this loose townscape.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations.</p> <p>Substantial mature native hedge on entire frontage with Norwich Road. Also along High House Farm Lane frontage. Likely to support wildlife, particularly as there is a large pond adjacent.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ but housing and water discharge not listed as requiring consultation with Natural England. Ponds within 250m of site. Amber risk zone for great crested newts. Not in GI corridor.</p> <p>Norfolk Wildlife Trust: Note that this site may be supporting species-rich grassland and this is possibly Priority Habitat. If site is to be taken forward this requires further investigation. Recommend ecological surveys for this site.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No heritage assets nearby.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Road network is heavily constrained with no footways.</p> <p>Relatively close to Norwich via A47.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Access requires significant hedge / tree removal. Site remote, no walking route to catchment school, network poor.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Sporadic residential. Ponds to south and pub beyond.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2016)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Residential development on this piece of land would open up a large area of undeveloped green land and significantly change the character of the area.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Is an existing field access onto Norwich Road which is overgrown. Whilst it is a break in the hedge line it is small and unobtrusive which would not be the case if it were used as a residential access.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Vacant, last used for agriculture some time ago.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Sporadic dwellings	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)	Hedges.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Substantial mature, native hedge on boundaries.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views into and out of the site because it is well contained.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2016)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is not recommended for allocation given significant visual impact in a rural location, loss of hedge, constrained road network and poor access to services.	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)
Norwich Policy Area		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate) Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	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)	No	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unknown	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing for local people will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is close to the current Development Boundary for Colton and within a short distance of local employment and the village hall; however, the road network in the vicinity of the site is narrow, unlit with no footways. The site itself has some limited areas of flood risk. The loss of the mature hedgerows around the site (to create suitable access) would significantly change the character of the area and have impacts on habitat.

Site Visit Observations

Site is not recommended for allocation given significant visual impact in a rural location, loss of hedge, constrained road network and poor access to services.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability

Site promoter has indicated the site is available immediately.

Achievability

Site promoter has suggested the site is deliverable, including affordable housing, but has not provided any supporting evidence.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is close to the current Development Boundary for Colton and within a short distance of local employment and the village hall; however, the road network in the vicinity of the site is narrow, unlit with no footways. The loss of the mature hedgerows around the site (to create suitable access) would have a significant visual impact as well as having impacts on habitat.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 29/04/2022

SN5015

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5015
Site address	Land west of the Norfolk Lurcher/Ugly Bug Inn Colton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	1994/1478 and 94/0271 for garden store and extension respectively
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	
Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing gated access onto the lane which is overgrown. NCC Highways – Amber. Access requires significant hedge / tree removal. Site remote, no walking route to catchment school, network poor.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	Distance to Barford Primary School over 3km along rural roads with no footways Honningham Thorpe Farms employment complex approx. 600m, other local employment in the vicinity.	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	Distance to Colton village hall and play area 850 metres Adjacent to Norfolk Lurcher public house.	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known constraints Environment Agency: Green	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known infrastructure on site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no upgrade planned via BBfN	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Undeveloped and unlikely to be contaminated. No known issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1 Small area of Surface Water Flood risk off site along track to north. LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. Environment Agency: 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	Tributary Farmland	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	B6 Yare Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 2 Very good (Light Blue)	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Despite there being various commercial uses around the site it now has the appearance of an undeveloped rural area, although it was previously car parking for the pub. This site is now an area of green space which is well treed.	Amber
Townscape	Green	No adverse impact on the village.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Undeveloped land with trees. Likely to support wildlife, particularly as there is a large pond opposite. NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ but housing and water discharge not listed as requiring consultation with Natural England. Pond on site and pond within 250m of site. Amber risk zone for great crested newts. Loss of trees/habitat which would not be easy to mitigate (not identified as priority habitat) not in GI corridor. Environment Agency: Green	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets nearby. HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Road network is heavily constrained with no footways. Relatively close to Norwich via A47. NCC Highways – Red. Access requires significant hedge / tree removal. Site remote, no walking route to catchment school, network poor.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Pub to east. Commercial units to west. Viking Nursery adjacent along road to south.	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2016)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No significant impact.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing wooden gate to road. Lane is narrow, single track with driveways for passing places. No path.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Unused land, trees on site. Has amenity value in the rural landscape.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Mainly commercial units, to west, south and east and one detached property to north. May be issues of noise and disturbance which would need to be considered.	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)	Hedges and trees on boundaries.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Mature trees within and around the site. Site has been unused for 8/9 years and has become overgrown, therefore may have become habitat particularly as there is a large pond opposite.	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.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views into the site as it is not cultivated, vegetation has grown and the road is narrow.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2016)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	<p>This is a small, narrow site in a rural setting which has significant vegetation and visual amenity value opposite the pub.</p> <p>The village does not have services and it is not possible to walk to any, apart from the pub opposite. Do not consider it appropriate to develop for residential.</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)
Norwich Policy Area		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate) Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	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)	No	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	No, unless road widening was required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No, suggested two larger barn-like dwellings.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is detached from the Settlement Limit for Colton, which would need to be extended around the adjacent pub and employment units for this site to make sense as a SL extension. Although a former pub car park, the site appears to have largely reverted to nature, with extensive vegetation. Employment opportunities are available close by, but other facilities (including the school) are more distant, and the road network in the vicinity of the site is narrow, unlit and has no footpaths.

Site Visit Observations

This is a small, narrow site in a rural setting which has significant vegetation and visual amenity value opposite the pub.

The village has limited services and it is not possible to walk to any, apart from the pub opposite.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability

Site promoter has indicated the site is available immediately.

Achievability

Site promoter has indicated that the site would be deliverable for two barn-style dwellings.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is detached from the Settlement Limit for Colton, which would need to be extended around the adjacent pub and employment units for this site to make sense as a SL extension. Although a former pub car park, the site appears to have largely reverted to nature, with extensive vegetation which contributes to the rural character of the area. Employment opportunities are available close by, but other facilities (including the school) are more distant, and the road network in the vicinity of the site is narrow, unlit and has no footpaths. The proximity of the pub and the employment uses immediately to the west of the site may impact residential amenity.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 29/04/2022