



# Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

## Site Assessments

### Brooke, Kirkstead and Howe

## Contents

|                |     |
|----------------|-----|
| SN0077SL ..... | 3   |
| SN0490 .....   | 4   |
| SN0579SL ..... | 14  |
| SN0583 .....   | 14  |
| SN0584 .....   | 22  |
| SN2018 .....   | 40  |
| SN2119 .....   | 40  |
| SN2122 .....   | 60  |
| SN2174 .....   | 69  |
| SN4004 .....   | 79  |
| SN4047 .....   | 88  |
| SN4065SL ..... | 97  |
| SN5016SL ..... | 106 |
| SN5058 .....   | 116 |

## SN0077SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail   | Comments   |
|--|--|
| Site Reference   | SN0077SL   |
| Site address   | The Field, Howe Lane   |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status) | Permission for three self-build dwellings, currently being implemented. <b>No further assessment undertaken.</b> |
| Planning History   | 2018/0868 full permission for three self-build dwellings, and subsequent discharges of conditions etc.           |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)                                      | 0.4ha  |
| Promoted Site Use, including<br>(a) Allocated site<br>(b) SL extension | SL extension for self-build properties   |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Supporting statement refers to two dwellings, which equates to 5 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       |

SN0490

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail  | Comments  |
|---|---|
| Site Reference  | SN0490  |
| Site address  | South east of Mereside, Brooke  |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning<br>policy status) |   |
| Planning History  | 2014/0474 - Outline for 17 dwellings - refused and dismissed at appeal. |
| Site size, hectares (as<br>promoted)                                      | 1.68ha gross, max of 1.18ha net (revised proposals March 2020)          |
| Promoted Site Use,<br>including<br>(c) Allocated site<br>(d) SL extension | Allocation  |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise<br>assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Up to 21 dwellings/ha (revised proposals March 2020)                    |
| 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 would be directly on to Mereside.<br><br><b>NCC Highways</b> – Green, subject to off-site carriageway widening and footway provision. No access to Hunstead Lane.   | Green                |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> | Green                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary School - 700m</li> <li>• Shop/Post Office/Garage - 625m</li> <li>• Park Farm complex - 850m</li> <li>• Brooke Industrial Park - 2,425m</li> <li>• Bus - Kings Head bus stop (service X41) - 700m</li> </ul> <p>Various other small scale employment opportunities in the vicinity - inc. vets, care home etc.</p> |                      |

| Constraint  | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| <i>Part 2:</i><br>Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul> |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village Hall (with community cafe and recreation facilities) - 825m</li> <li>• Pub (White Lion) - 300m</li> <li>Brooke Cricket Club - 850m</li> </ul>           | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity  | Green                 | No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed. AW advise sewers crossing the site   | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure  | Green                 | None identified on/close to the site.  | Green                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk  |                       | Available for the NR15 1JS area.   | Green                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route   |                       | Not effected.  | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability  | Green                 | Greenfield site with no known issues.  | Green                |
| Flood Risk  | Green                 | Floodrisk maps identify 1:1000 year surface water risk on adjoining roads (Mereside and Hunstead Lane), however previous application raised unresolved issues which formed part of the appeal dismissal. | Amber                |

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

| Impact                       | HELAA Score<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green                    | No designated landscapes.<br><br>Appeal dismissal refers to the site being in a slightly elevated position visible from Hunstead Lane.<br><br>Grade 3 Agricultural Land.  | Amber                   |
| Townscape                    | Red                      | Whilst Mereside already extends 20th Century housing a few houses depth away from The Street, this would push development into a more open landscape, all of which is included in the Conservation Area as part of the wider setting of Brooke. This would be clearly visible from Hunstead Lane and Brooke Footpath 7, which border the site to the southwest and northeast respectively.            | Red                     |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity  | Green                    | Kirstead Hall Wood CWS within 150m of the site, with a corresponding area of woodland immediately to the north east of the site. The presence of Great Crested Newts was also raised as an unresolved issue in the appeal dismissal.  | Amber                   |
| Historic Environment         | Red                      | The site is wholly within the Conservation Area, which extends to protect the rural setting of Brooke at this location. The site would impact significantly on the approach along Hunstead Lane and from Brooke Footpath 7. Immediately to the southwest are the heavily wooded grounds of Brooke House which is a non-designated (County listed) Historic Park and Garden.<br><br><b>HES</b> - Amber | Red                     |
| Open Space                   | Green                    | Not within an identified open space.  | Green                   |

| Impact                 | HELAA Score<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Transport and Roads    | Green                    | <p>Mereside links to the to The Street. Whilst Mereside itself has footways, this section of The Street (which runs southeast of the Meres) doesn't. Otherwise the site has reasonable access to the B1332 Norwich Road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, subject to off-site carriageway widening and footway provision. No access to Hunstead Lane.</p> | Amber                   |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green                    | Low density residential to the northwest, woodland to the northeast and southwest, arable agriculture to the southeast.  | Green                   |



#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?  | The neighbouring development at Mereside is later 20th Century, and extends a few houses depth from The Street. This site sits wholly within the Conservation Area and forms part of the rural setting to Brooke, and lies between two blocks of woodland. Even moderate/low density development of this site would clearly change the character of the area considerably. | Not applicable          |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?                                    | Access would be via Mereside, although there is a mature tree within the access (covered by Conservation Area protection) which may make full width road with footways more difficult to achieve.  | Not applicable          |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Greenfield meadow.   | Not applicable          |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)    | Low density residential to the northwest. Woodland to the northeast and southwest and open countryside to the south east. No compatibility issues.   | Not applicable          |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)   | Level site, with no significant changes in levels.   | Not applicable          |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)  | Domestic Boundaries with properties on Mereside and Hunstead Lane. Footpath and woodland to the northeast. Row of what appear to be regularly planted trees to the south east. Relatively open boundary with Hunstead Lane.  | Not applicable          |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Site within the Conservation Area, so trees already protected. Main concern is the mature tree in the Mereside access .  | 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)                            | Greenfield site, therefore unlikely to be contaminated.  | Not applicable       |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | Views into the site from Hunstead Lane and the adjoining footpath of the rural setting of the buildings in Brooke Conservation Area, also views directly across the site of the wooded park/garden setting of Brooke House (from the footpath) and in the opposite from Hunstead Lane of the woodland beyond the footpath.   | Not applicable       |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | The main concerns with the site centre around the impact on heritage (the Conservation Area and views of the wooded historic park/garden at Brooke House), townscape and landscape, with the development extending further east than the existing settlement along The Street. In addition consideration needs to be given to the potential loss of the mature tree in the access from Mereside and the proximity of Kirstead Hall Wood CWS. | Amber                |

## Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Open Countryside                  |   |                      |
| Conservation Area                 |   |                      |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                 | Partly adjacent to the existing Development Boundary on the northwest edge of the site, although the current Local Plan excludes some rear gardens from the Development Boundary at this location, to keep it relatively tight to the built form. | Amber                |

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| <b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)                                     | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?   | Private   | Not applicable              |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | No, although actively promoted by the agent over number of years.                               | Not applicable              |
| When might the site be available for development?   | Immediately. Actively promoted over a number of years, including the 2014 planning application. | Green                       |

| <b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b> |
|--|---|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No)<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | No. Although more evidence was supplied at the time of the 2014 planning application.   | Amber                     |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)     | None known. The promoter has indicated the scale of housing could be at the lower end of the range promoted, to accommodate more open space/green infrastructure. | Green                     |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?           | Yes   | Green                     |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                     | Potential enhanced open space/Green Infrastructure contribution.  |                           |

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is well located to access the main services and facilities in Brooke, and is situated just off The Street, which links to the main B1332 Norwich Road; although there is a lack of footways on this part of The Street. The main concerns lie around the site's location wholly within the Conservation Area, in the rural setting of Brooke and the consequent heritage, landscape and townscape impacts, that would be clearly visible from Hunstead Lane and Brooke Footpath 7, both of which adjoin the site. This issue was one of a number that were considered unresolved when a scheme for 17 dwellings was dismissed at appeal in 2015.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The main concerns with the site centre around the impact on heritage (the Conservation Area and views of the wooded historic park/garden at Brooke House), townscape and landscape, with the development extending further east than the existing settlement along The Street. In addition consideration needs to be given to the potential loss of the mature tree in the access from Mereside and the proximity of Kirstead Hall Wood CWS.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside - partly adjacent to the existing Development Boundary on the northwest edge of the site, although the current Local Plan excludes some rear gardens from the Development Boundary at this location, to keep it relatively tight to the built form.

### **Availability**

Available and actively promoted over many years.

### **Achievability**

2015 Appeal Decision indicated that a number of issues needed to be resolved with the site.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Unreasonable** - Although centrally located within Brooke, with good access to local services and facilities, the main issues centre around the heritage/townscape/landscape impacts of a site within the Conservation Area, which extends over this site to protect the rural setting of the settlement, and which is visible from Hunstead Lane and the adjoining PRoW. A number of issues also remained outstanding at the time the appeal for 17 dwellings was dismissed in 2015, including those related to ecology and surface water drainage.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: December 2020

## SN0579SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail   | Comments   |
|--|--|
| Site Reference   | SN0579SL   |
| Site address   | North of Waldor Cottage, High Green  |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status) | None.  |
| Planning History   | History of refusals for residential development, most recently for a bungalow (1997/1536). |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)                                      | 0.19ha   |
| Promoted Site Use, including<br>(e) Allocated site<br>(f) SL extension | SL extension for up to 10 starter homes  |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 53 dwellings/ha for 10 dwellings.  |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield   | Greenfield.  |

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

| Constraint   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Access to the site   | Amber                 | Current vehicular access to Waldor cottage, although this may not be suitable for a total of 11 dwellings.<br><br><b>NCC Highways</b> – 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. Highway networks sub-standard with no footway to village. | Amber                |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> | Amber                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary School - 1,425m</li> <li>• Shop/Post Office/Garage - 1,525m</li> <li>• Park Farm complex - 1,250m</li> <li>• Bus (King's Head stops, services inc X41 Bungay/Norwich) - 1,550m</li> </ul> <p>Various other small scale employment opportunities in the Brooke - inc. vets, care home etc.</p>                  |                      |

| Constraint   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| <b>Part 2:</b><br>Part 1 facilities, plus<br>○ Village/ community hall<br>○ Public house/ café<br>○ Preschool facilities<br>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village Hall (with recreation facilities) - 1,725m</li> <li>Pub (King's Head – currently being refurbished) - 1,550m</li> <li>Brooke Cricket Club - 1,725m</li> </ul>             | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity   | Amber                 | No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.  | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                 | None identified on/close to the site.  | Green                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk   |                       | Under consideration for further upgrades for the NR15 1JE area.  | Amber                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route  |                       | Not effected.  | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability   | Green                 | Greenfield garden plot with no known issues.   | Green                |
| Flood Risk   | Amber                 | Ditch runs north/south through the site and has an area of 1:30 year surface water flood risk along its path. Wider area at 1:100 year surface water risk. Majority of the site at 1:1000 year surface water flood risk. | 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> ) |                       | Tas Tributary Farmland |                      |



| Impact                       | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green                 | No designated landscapes.   | Green                |
| Townscape                    | Red                   | Large gap between two relatively rural properties, approx. 450m from the edge of the main built area of the settlement.   | Amber                |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity  | Red                   | The site is less than 150m from Brooke Wood, which is both a CWS and Ancient Woodland.  | Amber                |
| Historic Environment         | Amber                 | Waterfield Cottage (approx. 125m to the north) is a listed building within an archaeological site.<br><br>HES - Amber   | Amber                |
| Open Space                   | Green                 | Not within an identified open space   | Green                |
| Transport and Roads          | Amber                 | The site is approximately 500m from the nearest footways linking to services and facilities in Brooke. Access would be required onto a section of road under the national speed limit, and the majority of the distance to Brooke is also covered by the 60mph limit.<br><br>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. Highway networks sub-standard with no footway to village. | Red                  |
| Neighbouring Land Uses       | Amber                 | The site is between two residential properties, with agricultural land to the rear (west) and commercial stables opposite (east).   | Green                |

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?  | Whilst the site is approx 125m from the Waterfiled Cottage listed building, there does not appear to be any immediate inter-visibility; however, a development which required removal of the frontage hedgerow would considerably change the character of the area and the approach to the Conservation Area. This would be an isolated group of dwellings, detached from the settlement. | Not applicable          |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?                                    | There is an existing (very narrow) access to the current dwelling, however creating a suitable access for a further 10 dwellings, particularly immediately opposite the entrance to the Wood Farm stables and within a 60mph limit, may be difficult and significantly change the character of the area.  | Not applicable          |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Domestic garden, heavily planted with trees.  | Not applicable          |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)    | Neighbouring uses are a mix of individual residential (north and south), agricultural to the rear (west) and commercial stables opposite (east). No immediate compatibility issues.   | Not applicable          |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)   | Site appears level,   | Not applicable          |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)  | Would appear to have hedgerows to all boundaries.   | Not applicable          |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Substantial hedgerow to the road frontage, numerous trees on site and a ditch running north/south through the site.   | 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)                            | Greenfield site, therefore unlikely to be contaminated.   | Not applicable       |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | The site can be seen in long distance views when leaving Brooke along High Green, forming part of a wooded backdrop along the western side of the road.   | Not applicable       |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | The site is clearly detached from the main built area of Brooke and as such would not work well in townscape terms. The site is in a 60mph area, with no footways connecting to the village. The site is currently heavily planted with trees and hedging and forms part of a wider treed landscape, against the backdrop of Brooke Wood, Ancient Woodland. | Amber                |

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Open Countryside                  |  |                      |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                 | Detached from the Settlement Limit by approx. 450m | Amber                |

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| <b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)                                     | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?   | Private   | Not applicable              |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | No. Promoted by the owner for 10 'starter homes'.                       | Not applicable              |
| When might the site be available for development?   | Within 5 years. No indication of how 'stater homes' would be delivered. | Amber                       |

| <b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b> |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No)<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Sketch layout for 10 semi-detached starter homes.                | Amber                     |
| 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?           | Not applicable as the site is being promoted for 'starter homes' | Amber                     |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                     | No   |                           |

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Whilst the site is not immediately adjacent to any sensitive features, it is in close proximity to Brooke Wood Ancient Woodland/CWS, Waterfield Cottage listed building/archaeological site (all within approx. 150m). Development would effectively be an isolated group of houses in the Countryside. The site is at the limits of walking distances to key services/facilities, and approx. 500m beyond the existing footways and a section of road under the national speed limit, which would not be attractive to walk. Ditch and associated surface water flood risk is a concern.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is clearly detached from the main built area of Brooke and as such would not work well in townscape terms. The site is in a 60mph area, with no footways connecting to the village. The site is currently heavily planted with trees and hedging and forms part of a wider treed landscape, against the backdrop of Brooke Wood, Ancient Woodland.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside, detached from the Settlement Limit.

### **Availability**

Promoted by the owner as available.

### **Achievability**

Promoted for 'starter homes' without any supporting evidence as to how these would be delivered. As such, there was no supporting information re delivery of affordable housing.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Unreasonable** - The site is promoted for 'starter homes' in a location which is highly unlikely to encourage walking and cycling for everyday journeys on an unlit, 60mph road with no footways. The site has a substantial frontage hedge and extensive planting, the removal of which would significantly change the character of the area, particularly in the context of the Ancient Woodland to the rear of the site, the nearby listed building and when existing Brooke along High Green. The ditch and associated surface water flood risk is also a concern.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: December 2020

SN0583

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail  | Comments   |
|---|--|
| Site Reference  | SN0583   |
| Site address  | Laurel Farm, north of The Street                                   |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status)    | None.  |
| Planning History  | None relevant.   |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)   | 6.8ha as promoted  |
| Promoted Site Use,<br>including<br>(g) Allocated site<br>(h) SL extension | Allocation   |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)    | 25 dwellings/ha on a small part of the site.                       |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield  | Greenfield (depending on current use of the Laurel Farm buildings) |

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

| <b>Constraint</b>  | <b>HELAA Score<br/>(R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score<br/>(R/ A/ G)</b> |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Access to the site | Amber                            | <p>Access is proposed via lane which is narrow (single carriageway), unmade and adjoins two listed buildings. Alternative is proposed via Burgess Way, however this requires access across third party land, which although promoted by the same agent, is not included within this proposal.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, insufficient frontage for safe access. Existing access too narrow to construct road, footway and junction with required visibility. May require ped crossing on B1332</p> | Red                             |

| Constraint   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> | Green                 | <p>Walking/cycling distances measured using the Laurels Farm access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary School - 650m</li> <li>• Shop/Post Office/Garage - 575m</li> <li>• Park Farm complex – 925m</li> <li>• Bus - White Lion bus stop, service 41 - 200m</li> <li>• Brooke Industrial Park - 2,350m</li> </ul> <p>Various other small scale employment opportunities in the vicinity - inc. vets, care home etc.</p> |                      |
| <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>   |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village Hall (with community cafe and recreation facilities) - 800m</li> <li>• Pub (White Lion) - 225m</li> <li>• Brooke Cricket Club - 825m</li> </ul>   | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity   | Green                 | No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.  | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                 | None identified on/close to the site.  | Green                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk   |                       | Available for the NR15 1JW area.   | Green                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route  |                       | Not effected.  | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability   | Amber                 | Predominantly a greenfield site with no known issues, however there are a cluster of agricultural buildings close to the Laurels Farm entrance.  | Amber                |
| Flood Risk   | Green                 | No flood risk identified within the main body of the site, bu 1:100 year surface water flood risk in the Laurels Farm entrance.  | Amber                |



| Impact   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Type<br>( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )        | Not applicable        | Tributary Farmland  | Not applicable       |
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) |                       | Chet Tributary Farmland.  |                      |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                     | Green                 | No designated landscapes.<br><br>Large arable field, visible from a distance from Entrance Lane/Norwich Road. Also Brooke Footpath 3 runs north south through the site.<br><br>Grade 3 Agricultural Lane  | Amber                |
| Townscape  | Red                   | The site is effectively a detached field, which doesn't link directly to the development at Burgess Way, or in The Street. As such it would not integrate well the settlement. The development on The Street is within the heart of the Conservation Area with a number of listed buildings in very close proximity. Any vehicular access, if it were possible to create one, could have a significant impact on the character of The Street. | Red                  |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity                                      | Green                 | No designated sites in close proximity.   | Green                |
| Historic Environment   | Red                   | The development on The Street is within the heart of the Conservation Area with a number of listed buildings in very close proximity. Any vehicular access, if it were possible to create one, could have a significant impact on the character of The Street.<br><br>Impact on the heritage assets would be clearly felt from Brooke Footpath 3, which runs through the site.<br><br><b>HES - Amber</b>                                      | Red                  |

| Impact                 | HELAA Score<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Open Space             | Green                    | Not within an identified open space.   | Green                   |
| Transport and Roads    | Green                    | <p>Whilst the access to the site is problematic, The Street itself is of a suitable standard, is covered by an existing 30mph limit, is a bus route and has a suitable footway. The Street links to the main B1332.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Green, insufficient frontage for safe access. Existing access too narrow to construct road, footway and junction with required visibility. May require ped crossing on B1332.</p> | Green                   |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green                    | Principally residential to the south and east (with some agricultural buildings and a pub), and agricultural to the north and west.  | Green                   |

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?  | Large site immediately to the rear of the Conservation Area. There are number of listed buildings in the CA immediately south of the site, of most concern are those within the access to Laurels Farm (37 and 35 The Street). In townscape terms the site would appear to be detached from both The Street and Burgess Way; whilst vies from The Street may be limited, the site is likely to be visible (and somewhat incongruous) from | Not applicable       |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?                                    | Not clear how the site would be accessed. The Laurels Farm access is narrow, unmade and contains listed buildings (37 and 35 The Street), whilst access to Burgess Way would require access though the adjoining proposed site (SN0584); although promoted by the same agent, they have been promoted as two separate parcels. SN0584 itself does not appear to have access right secured to Burgess Way.                                 | Not applicable       |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Greenfield arable land.   | Not applicable       |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)    | Predominantly residential to the south (with some agricultural buildings and the pub); arable agriculture to the north and west, paddock to the east.   | Not applicable       |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)   | Level site with no obvious issues.  | Not applicable       |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)  | Agricultural field boundaries, with patchy/sparse hedging.  | Not applicable       |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | No obvious features within the site. Most notable trees appear to be to the north west within the adjoining field.  | 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)                            | Greenfield site, therefore unlikely to be contaminated.   | Not applicable       |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | Longer distance views into the site from both Entrance Lane and Norwich Road. Form the former the development in the Conservation Area can be seen in the distance.   | Not applicable       |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Difficult to see how the site will be accessed, as it is detached from Burgess Way and access via Laurels Farm is not appropriate. The site would form a block of development slightly detached from the settlement, which would be visible from a distance. Currently the site is too large for the Village Clusters approach, and there is no obvious smaller parcel that would make a suitable allocation. | Red                  |

## Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Open Countryside                  |  |                      |
| Conservation Area                 |  |                      |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                 | Largely detached from the current Development Boundary | Amber                |

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| <b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)                                     | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?   | Private   | Not applicable              |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | No  | Not applicable              |
| When might the site be available for development?   | Within 5 years. Site is in a single ownership, however access via Burgess Way would appear to involve multiple parties. | Amber                       |

| <b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b> |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No)<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Limited, as 'no formal appraisal of the site has been undertaken'.   | Amber                     |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)     | None known, although if a larger site than 25 dwellings were to be considered, off site requirements may be necessary. | Green                     |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?           | Yes  | Green                     |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                     | No   |                           |

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Whilst the field itself has no immediate constraints, and the site is within a reasonable walking distance of the services and facilities in Brooke, there are a number of concerns with the site relating to access, heritage impacts, and the impact on the townscape/landscape.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Difficult to see how the site will be accessed, as it is detached from Burgess Way and access via Laurels Farm is not appropriate. The site would form a block of development slightly detached from the settlement, which would be visible from a distance. Currently the site is too large for the Village Clusters approach, and there is no obvious smaller parcel that would make a suitable allocation.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside, and other than the Laurels Farm access the site is detached from the current Development Boundary.

### **Availability**

Available and the principle area of the site is within a single ownership, however the site is promoted for 150 units and no confirmation was received that a small parcel of the site would be acceptable to the promoter.

### **Achievability**

No formal appraisal has been undertaken and it is not clear how suitable access would be achieved as no arrangement seems to have been sought with the adjoining landowners. No confirmation that a smaller site would be acceptable to the site promoters.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Unreasonable** - The main concerns with this site include the lack of clear access arrangements, the impact on the rural setting of the Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings (particularly those on the Laurels Farm access and visible from Brooke Footpath 3 which runs through the site), the poor form of the site in townscape terms and the landscape impact of a detached development in a relatively unscreened site.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: November 2020

SN0584

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail  | Comments   |
|---|--|
| Site Reference  | SN0584   |
| Site address  | West of Burgess Way, Brooke  |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning<br>policy status) | None.  |
| Planning History  | 1988/3623 residential development refused.                         |
| Site size, hectares (as<br>promoted)                                      | 0.75ha   |
| Promoted Site Use,<br>including<br>(i) Allocated site<br>(j) SL extension | Allocation   |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise<br>assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Promoted for up to 25 dwellings. 33 dwellings/ha for 25 dwellings. |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield  | Greenfield   |

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

| Is the site located in, or does the site include: | 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 via Burgess Way, however the site submission suggests access rights need to be acquired.<br><br>NCC Highways – Green<br><br>NCC Highways Meeting - Green  | Amber                |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> | Green                 | Walking/cycling distances measured using via Burgess Way.<br><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary School - 1,350m</li> <li>• Shop/Post Office/Garage - 1,225m</li> <li>• Park Farm complex – 1,500m</li> <li>• Brooke Industrial Park - 2,350m (via Entrance Lane)</li> <li>• Bus - White Lion bus stop (service 41) - 575m</li> </ul><br>Various other small scale employment opportunities in the vicinity - inc. vets, care home etc. |                      |



| Constraint   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| <b>Part 2:</b><br>Part 1 facilities, plus<br>○ Village/ community hall<br>○ Public house/ café<br>○ Preschool facilities<br>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village Hall (with community cafe and recreation facilities) - 1,425m</li> <li>Pub (White Lion) - 775m</li> <li>Brooke Cricket Club - 1,450m</li> </ul> | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity   | Green                 | No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed. AW advise sewers crossing the site   | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                 | None identified on/close to the site.  | Green                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk   |                       | Available for the NR15 1JY area.   | Green                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route  |                       | Not effected.  | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability   | Amber                 | Greenfield site with no known issues.  | Green                |
| Flood Risk   | Green                 | No flood risk issues identified.   | Green                |

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

| Impact                       | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green                 | <p>No designated landscapes.</p> <p>Narrow site, enclosed by hedges, follows the edge of the existing built development.</p> <p>Grade 3 Agricultural Land</p> <p><a href="#">SNC Landscape Meeting</a> - contained site but would need to retain/reinforce boundaries.</p>   | Green                |
| Townscape                    | Red                   | <p>The site effectively forms a linear strip beside existing 20th Century residential development. The southern end of the site adjoins the Conservation Area and is in close proximity to a number of listed properties, particularly 57 The Street.</p> <p><a href="#">SNC Heritage &amp; Design</a> - in townscape terms I would have thought this is not an ideal plot in terms of access etc.</p> | Amber                |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity  | Green                 | No designated sites in close proximity.  | Green                |

| Impact                 | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Historic Environment   | Red                   | <p>The southern end of the site adjoins the Conservation Area and is in close proximity to a number of listed properties, particularly 57 The Street.</p> <p>Impacts would need to be assessed from Brooke Footpath 3, which runs north/south through the adjoining site.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> - it would result in a degree of harm to the setting of the listed building and its rural setting to the rear. Also the setting of the conservation area, bearing in mind Historic England objections to the larger development site to the west - which although larger had same issues (even less so, as that was <u>not</u> behind any listed buildings).</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p> | Amber                |
| Open Space             | Green                 | Not within an identified open space.   | Green                |
| Transport and Roads    | Green                 | <p>Access via Burgess Way, modern estate road with access to The Street via St Peter's Road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Green</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - Green</p>   | Green                |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green                 | Principally residential to the south and east and agricultural to the north and west.  | Green                |

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations   | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?   | The site is relatively well contained by exiting hedging, therefore impacts on the Conservation Area and listed building to the south would appear to be limited. the site's linear shape keep it close to the existing built form, but would limit the layout/form of development. | Not applicable          |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?   | Suitable width road with footpaths appears to connect to the site.  | Not applicable          |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)  | Greenfield meadow/paddock.  | Not applicable          |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)   | 20th Century bungalow development to the east, which may iMac on the scale of housing possible, agricultural land to the north and west.  | Not applicable          |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)  | Level site with no obvious issues.  | Not applicable          |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)   | Low level domestic boundaries to the existing properties. Varying degrees of hedging to the remaining boundaries.   | Not applicable          |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?  | No obvious features within the site, hedges likely to me retained to soften the impact of development.  | Not applicable          |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | Greenfield site, therefore unlikely to be contaminated.   | Not applicable          |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape  | Views into the site from the existing Burgess Way development of the meadow/paddock with a backdrop of hedging. views out of the site seem limited.   | Not applicable          |

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | The main considerations will be whether the site impacts unduly on the nearby listed properties and the Conservation Area and what form of development could be achieved given the adjoining bungalows and the shape of the site. Whilst there are footways to the main services and facilities, the route via Burgess Way, St Peter's Road and The Street is not the most direct. | Amber                   |

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)            | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| Open Countryside                             |  |                         |
| Conservation Area (immediately to the south) |  |                         |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                            | Adjoins the existing Development Boundary to the east. | Green                   |

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| <b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)                                     | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?   | Private  | Not applicable              |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | No   | Not applicable              |
| When might the site be available for development?   | Within 5 years. Site in multiple ownership, but within the same family. Access rights need to be acquired. | Amber                       |

| <b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b> |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No)<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Limited, as 'no formal appraisal of the site has been undertaken'. | Amber                     |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)     | None known.  | Green                     |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?           | Yes  | Green                     |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                     | No   |                           |

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is reasonably located within the settlement and has few constraints, other than the proximity of the Conservation Area and several listed buildings (particularly 57 The Street). Whilst access would appear possible, the rights need to be acquired. Unlikely to achieve the level of development suggested in the submission.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The main considerations will be whether the site impacts unduly on the nearby listed properties and the Conservation Area and what form of development could be achieved given the adjoining bungalows and the shape of the site. Whilst there are footways to the main services and facilities, the route via Burgess Way, St Peter's Road and The Street is not the most direct.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside, but immediately adding the existing Development Boundary.

### **Availability**

Available, although in multiple ownerships within the same family.

### **Achievability**

No formal appraisal has been undertaken, and the submission is based on achieving 25 dwellings, which seems unlikely given the layout of the site and the adjoining bungalow development.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Unreasonable** - The site is reasonably well connect to the services and facilities in Brooke, with no obvious features on the site itself; however, the scale and form of development would be limited by the shape of the site and the adjoining bungalow development on Burgess Way. The submission indicates access rights need to be acquired and this is based on the site being put forward for 25 dwellings, the feasibility of which has yet to be demonstrated, therefore there are questions over the achievability of the site. In addition, it is considered that the impacts on the rural setting of the Conservation Area, and a number of listed buildings within it (particularly 57 The Street) would make this site unacceptable.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: November 2020

## SN2018

### Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail   | Comments   |
|--|--|
| Site Reference   | SN2018   |
| Site address   | East of Norwich Road   |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status) |  |
| Planning History   | Part of 2018/1780 - 148 dwellings and 210 place primary school (withdrawn) |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)                                      | up to 4.5ha  |
| Promoted Site Use, including<br>(k) Allocated site<br>(l) SL extension | Allocation for up to 75 dwellings.   |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 17 dwellings/ha as promoted.   |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield   | Greenfield.  |

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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



### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

| Constraint         | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Access to the site | Amber                 | <p>Frontage to the B1332 Norwich Road, to the rear of an existing layby. Withdrawn application (2018/1780) required a roundabout, however it is not clear if this would be required for a substantially lower level of development. Site also has a secondary pedestrian access between 30 and 32 Norwich Road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, subject to access via 36m icd roundabout at GNLP0432, otherwise not acceptable. Access south of BKE1 to be used for pedestrian/cycle &amp; emergency only. Development layout to provide highway connection to land east of allocation. May require provision of a formal crossing facility at B1332 Norwich Rd near The Street/High Green. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.</p> | Amber                |

| Constraint   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> | Green                 | <p>Measured via the proposed pedestrian access, where appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary School - 625m</li> <li>• Shop/Post Office/Garage - 475m</li> <li>• Park Farm complex – 800m</li> <li>• Employment - (Brooke Industrial Park) - 1,325m</li> <li>• Bus - Kings Head bus stop (41/X41 services) - 400m</li> </ul> <p>Various other small scale employment opportunities in the vicinity.</p> |                      |
| <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>   |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village Hall (with recreation facilities and community cafe) - 350m</li> <li>• Pub (Kings Head – currently being refurbished) - 400m (White Lion also within 1,800m)</li> </ul> <p>Brooke Cricket Club - 750m</p>  | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity   | Amber                 | No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed. AW advise sewers crossing the site  | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                 | None identified on/close to the site.   | Green                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk   |                       | Under consideration for upgrading for the NR15 1AB area.  | Amber                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route  |                       |   | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability   | Green                 | Greenfield site with no known issues.   | Green                |
| Flood Risk   | Green                 | <p>None identified</p> <p><b>LFFA</b> - Few or no Constraints.</p>  | Green                |

| Impact   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Type<br>( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )        | Not applicable        | Tributary Farmland   | Not applicable       |
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) |                       | Chet Tributary Farmland  |                      |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                     | Green                 | No designated landscapes.<br><br>Open agricultural landscape with few features to screen additional development.<br><br>Grade 3 Agricultural Land.   | Amber                |
| Townscape  | Amber                 | Would extend the growth of Brooke towards Poringland, with only the exiting field boundary delineating from further expansion.   | Amber                |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity                                      | Amber                 | No designated sites in close proximity.  | Green                |
| Historic Environment   | Amber                 | Distant views of the Brooke Conservation Area from Norwich Road. Site adjoins the Conservation Area at the southern end and is within approx. 300m of a number of Listed Buildings fronting The Street.<br><br>Archaeological record north of the site.<br><br>HES - Amber | Amber                |
| Open Space   | Green                 | Not within an identified open space, although adjoins the recreation facilities at the village hall to the south.  | Green                |

| Impact                 | HELAA Score<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Transport and Roads    | Green                    | <p>Frontage to the B1332 Norwich Road and footpaths to the main village services and facilities.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, subject to access via 36m icd roundabout at GNLP0432, otherwise not acceptable. Access south of BKE1 to be used for pedestrian/cycle &amp; emergency only. Development layout to provide highway connection to land east of allocation. May require provision of a formal crossing facility at B1332 Norwich Rd near The Street/High Green. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.</p> | Amber                   |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green                    | Low density residential on the existing B1332 frontage, agricultural land to the east, north and opposite side of the B1332. Village hall ground to the south.  | Green                   |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?  | <p>Although Brooke Lodge listed building is immediately to the north, the grounds are heavily treed.</p> <p>Some possible impact on distant views of Brooke Conservation Area and the setting of the listed buildings to the south (on The Street).</p> <p>Extends the settlement northwards towards Poringland and would require reinforcement of the existing field boundary to the north marking the transition from built form to countryside.</p> | Not applicable          |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?                                    | Direct access to the B1332, may require speed reduction measures.  | Not applicable          |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Greenfield, with no obvious concerns.  | Not applicable          |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)    | Mixture of low density residential and agricultural to the south and west. Housing fronting the B1332, which may impact on the form of development. Village hall grounds immediately to the south. Agricultural to the north and east. No compatibility issues.  | Not applicable          |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)   | Level site with no obvious concerns.   | Not applicable          |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)  | Domestic boundaries with existing properties. Open field boundaries to the road frontage, north and east, which are likely to require reinforcement to give more containment to the site.  | Not applicable          |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | The most significant trees are in the existing highway, between the lay-by and the B1332, or outside the site, rear of village hall.   | Not applicable          |

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|----------------------|
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)                            | Overhead wires along the northern boundary.<br><br>Greenfield, therefore unlikely to be contaminated.  | Not applicable       |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | Open landscape with views across the site to woodland in the distance and Brooke village to the south.<br><br>Site more contained where it adjoins the built area of the village.  | Not applicable       |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Open agricultural field with few features on the site itself, however it does afford views across the wider countryside.<br><br>Well located in terms of access to services and facilities, and with direct access to the B1332. | Green                |

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Open Countryside                  |   |                      |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                 | Adjoins the existing Development Boundary to the south. | Green                |

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| <b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)                                     | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?   | Private   | Not applicable              |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Being promoted by a local house builder who has built the recent adjoining development. | Not applicable              |
| When might the site be available for development?   | Within 5 years  | Green                       |

| <b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b> |
|--|---|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No)<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Site has been part of a previous planning application, therefore there has been investigation of many of the issues related to development of the site. Promoter has confirmed that there are no ransom strips that would impede development. | Green                     |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)     | Site owners control a larger land holding, therefore additional land for open space/GI could be made available.<br><br>Highway works to reduce speeds on the B1332 may be required.   | Amber                     |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?           | Yes   | Green                     |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                     | No  |                           |

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Broadly the site is suitable for development, subject to no overriding concerns regarding the impact on the Conservation Area or nearby listed buildings, and suitable access arrangements from the B1332. Otherwise the site is well located and relatively unconstrained.

However the site is larger than required for the village clusters document, and a smaller part of the site has been put forward (ref. SN0432REVA), which is more in keeping with the scale envisaged. The site does not offer any overriding benefits that would justify a larger allocation.

### **Site Visit Observations**

An open, level site with few features. However the site does provide views across the open countryside to woodlands and the Conservation Area beyond. Site boundaries would need reinforcement to give a level of containment, and careful design to create development in depth when adjoining development is principally frontage only.

### **Local Plan Designations**

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

### **Availability**

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

### **Achievability**

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Unreasonable** - Whilst the site is well located and relatively unconstrained, it is too large for the purposes of the VCHAP, with no overriding benefits to justify a larger site. A smaller part of the site is considered as SN0432REVA.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: November 2020



## SN2119

### Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail  | Comments  |
|---|---|
| Site Reference  | SN2119  |
| Site address  | North of High Green/West of Astley Cooper Place                                 |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status)    | Previous 'reasonable alternative' in the preparation of the current Local Plan. |
| Planning History  | No recent planning history.   |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)   | 1.9ha   |
| Promoted Site Use,<br>including<br>(m) Allocated site<br>(n) SL extension | Allocation  |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)    | Smaller part of the site for upto 25 dwellings at 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                 | <p>Frontage to High Green within the 30mph speed limits area. There is no footway on High Green between the site and the entrance to Astley Cooper Place, approx. 200m from the site. The site promoter has suggested that a suitable footway can be accommodated within the existing highway, although the impact on the character of the Conservation Area would need to be considered.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, not acceptable. Limited forward visibility in vicinity of site &amp; f/w to village centre starts at Astley Cooper Place, not clear that a facility can be provided within the highway in the existing developed area – approx. 200m. Acceptable level of visibility from site access unlikely to be achievable.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - poor alignment of High Green, with limited forward visibility, and very questionable whether a footway to link with the existing can be achieved. Previous pre-app on the site suggests a direct link to Astley Cooper Place is not possible.</p> | Red                  |
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> | Green                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary School - 825m</li> <li>• Shop/Post Office/Garage - 950m</li> <li>• Park Farm complex - 675m</li> <li>• Brooke Industrial Park 2,700m</li> <li>• Bus (King's Head stops, services inc X41 Bungay/Norwich) - 1,000m</li> </ul> <p>Various other small scale employment opportunities in the vicinity - inc. vets, care home etc.</p>   |                      |

| Constraint   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| <b>Part 2:</b><br>Part 1 facilities, plus<br>○ Village/ community hall<br>○ Public house/ café<br>○ Preschool facilities<br>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village Hall (with recreation facilities) - 1,125m</li> <li>Pub (King's Head – currently being refurbished) - 975m (White Lion also within 1,800m)</li> </ul> Brooke Cricket Club - 1,150m | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity   | Amber                 | No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed. AW advise sewers crossing the site  | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                 | None identified on/close to the site.   | Green                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk   |                       | Available for the NR15 1JD area.  | Green                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route  |                       | Not effected.   | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability   | Green                 | Greenfield site with no known issues.   | Green                |
| Flood Risk   | Amber                 | Area of surface water flood risk (inc 1:100 year) running diagonally northeast/southwest across the site, along the line of vegetation.<br><br><b>LFFA</b> - Few or no Constraints.   | Amber                |

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

| Impact                       | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green                 | <p>No designated landscapes.</p> <p>Site well contained by vegetation, although this would depend how much needed to be removed to provide a workable layout on an unusually shaped site.</p> <p>Grade 3 Agricultural Land</p> <p><a href="#">SNC Landscape Meeting</a> - unfortunate removal of maturing trees and hedgerows would be required; potential off-site issues if trees to be removed on third party land, which would seem likely to create the required footway.</p>                        | Green                |
| Townscape                    | Amber                 | <p>Frontage development on High Green is generally low density with mature planting and rural in appearance. This frontage development also forms part of the Conservation Area. However moderately higher density estate type development does exist to the rear of properties on the north side of High Green, at Astley Cooper Place, Coniston Road, Brecon Road etc. The orientation/shape of the site would lead to a liner form of development, running roughly at a right angle to High Green.</p> | Amber                |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity  | Amber                 | <p>Small area of TPO trees (Wood Farm) along the eastern boundary with Ashley Cooper Way and other parts of the site are also heavily vegetated.</p>  | Amber                |

| Impact               | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|----------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Historic Environment | Amber                 | <p>The site adjoins the Conservation Area and has a listed building (66 High Green) in close proximity.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage</b> - Concern at the setting of 66 High Green, which unfortunately sits at the back of its curtilage (and also within the setting). I note that there is some open space in the plan is provided but it does not really mitigate impact/harm that much.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>  | Amber                |
| Open Space           | Green                 | Not within an identified open space   | Green                |
| Transport and Roads  | Amber                 | <p>Lack of footway along High Green between the site and Astley Cooper Place. The site promoter has suggested that a suitable footway can be accommodated within the existing highway, although the impact on the character of the Conservation Area would need to be considered.</p> <p>Site is within the 30 mph area with reasonable access to the main B1332.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, not acceptable. Limited forward visibility in vicinity of site &amp; f/w to village centre starts at Astley Cooper Place, not clear that a facility can be provided within the highway in the existing developed area – approx. 200m. Acceptable level of visibility from site access unlikely to be achievable.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - poor alignment of High Green, with limited forward visibility, and very questionable whether a footway to link with the existing can be achieved. Previous pre-app on the site suggests a direct link to Astley Cooper Place is not possible.</p> | Red                  |

| Impact                    | HELAA Score<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Neighbouring<br>Land Uses | Green                    | Existing residential to the south and<br>east and agricultural to the north<br>and west. | Green                   |

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?  | <p>Although close to the Conservation Area, existing development outside of the CA and retention of existing vegetation would limit any impacts.</p> <p>Principal concern would be the impact of the listed building at 66 High Green.</p> <p>In townscape terms any development would be a right angles to High Green, which would need careful consideration, although there is existing similar development at Astley Cooper Place, Coniston Road, Brecon Road etc.</p> | Not applicable       |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?                                    | Site frontage within the 30 mph area.  | Not applicable       |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Greenfield site, although heavily vegetated. No obvious concerns other than protection of any important trees etc.   | Not applicable       |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)    | Neighbouring land uses are medium/low density residential (south and east) and agricultural (north and west), with no compatibility issues.  | Not applicable       |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)   | Broadly level, rising slightly away from High Green.   | Not applicable       |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)  | Hedgerow to the site frontage. Heavily vegetated along the western boundary. Domestic scale boundaries with existing residential properties on Astley Cooper Place.  | Not applicable       |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | TPO trees on the eastern boundary. Western Part of the site heavily vegetated and likely to require ecological survey and assessment for TPOing of trees   | 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)                            | Greenfield site, therefore unlikely to be contaminated.  | Not applicable       |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | The site is relatively contained, with views into the from High Green and the adjoining residential properties at Astley Cooper Place, with the backdrop of existing vegetation.   | Not applicable       |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | The site is relatively well contained, with direct access to High Green. Impacts on the Conservation Area should be limited, although this will need to take into account any works needed to create the necessary footways. However the form of development will need to be carefully considered, given the orientation of the site and the extensive vegetation on site (including, but not exclusively the TPO trees). The adjacent listed building will also be a consideration. | Amber                |

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Open Countryside                  |  |                      |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                 | Adjacent to the existing Development Boundary to the east. | Green                |

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| <b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)                                     | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?   | Private   | Not applicable              |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Not being marketed, but promoted on behalf of the owner by an agent with a land sales experience. | Not applicable              |
| When might the site be available for development?   | Immediately. No known legal restrictions to bringing the site forward.                            | Green                       |

| <b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b> |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No)<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Some evidence supplied to address issues raised by the previous GNLP assessment of the site.   | Green                     |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)     | Off-site footways  | Amber                     |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?           | Yes  | Green                     |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                     | Potential primary school, if developed in conjunction with the adjoining SN2122, however, the need for this has not been demonstrated. |                           |

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Whilst the site is well located in terms of access to local services and facilities, it also has some constraints in terms of: the proximity of the Conservation Area and the listed property at 66 High Green, which it is set at the back of its plot, and which the development is considered will impact detrimentally; extensive areas of vegetation on site, over and above the presence of TPO trees; the need to provide a footway to link to existing provision at Astley Cooper Place (the provision of which could also impact on trees within the Conservation Area; the alignment of/forward visibility on High Green at this location; and small areas of surface water flood risk within the site.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is relatively well contained, with direct access to High Green (although this is constrained, see Suitability). However, the site would impact on the setting of 66 High Green and on the wider Conservation Area, particularly if the implementation of a footway required the loss of trees/hedging.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside but adjoining the current Development Boundary.

### **Availability**

Landowner knows of no reason why the site could not be developed immediately, and is being promoted by an agent with a land sales experience.

### **Achievability**

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is within a reasonable distance of the services and facilities in Brooke, however there are concerns related to: the suitability of High Green in this location and the ability to achieve a safe access; the ability to achieve a footway to link with existing provision and the impact this could have on the Conservation Area; and the impact on the setting of the Listed dwelling at 66 High Green. The site itself includes areas of surface water flood risk and extensive vegetation. The deliverability is subject to demonstrating access via Astley Copper Place.

### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: November 2020

## SN2122

### Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail  | Comments  |
|---|---|
| Site Reference  | SN2122  |
| Site address  | East of Wood Farm   |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status)    | None  |
| Planning History  | None recent.  |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)   | 2.71ha  |
| Promoted Site Use,<br>including<br>(o) Allocated site<br>(p) SL extension | Allocation.   |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)    | Smaller part of the site for up to 25 dwellings at 25 dwellings/ha. |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield  | Greenfield.   |

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

| <b>Constraint</b>  | <b>HELAA Score<br/>(R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score<br/>(R/ A/ G)</b> |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Access to the site | Amber                            | <p>Frontage to High Green within the 30mph speed limits area, however no footways until the entrance to Astley Cooper Place, approx. 300m from the site. The site promoter has suggested that a suitable footway can be accommodated within the existing highway, in conjunction with the adjoining site, although the impact on the character of the Conservation Area would need to be considered.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, not acceptable. Limited forward visibility in vicinity of site &amp; f/w to village centre starts at Astley Cooper Place, not clear that a facility can be provided within the highway in the existing developed area – approx. 200m plus adjacent site frontage of approx. 70m.</p> | Amber                           |

| Constraint   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> | Green                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary School - 925m</li> <li>• Shop/Post Office/Garage - 1,050m</li> <li>• Park Farm complex – 775m</li> <li>• Bus (King's Head stops, services inc X41 Bungay/Norwich) - 1,100m</li> </ul> <p>Various other small scale employment opportunities in the vicinity - inc. vets, care home, 2 x pubs etc.</p> |                      |
| <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>   |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village Hall (with recreation facilities) - 1,225m</li> <li>• Pub (King's Head – currently being refurbished) - 1,075m (White Lion also within 1,800m)</li> </ul> <p>Brooke Cricket Club - 1,250m</p>   | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity   | Amber                 | No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed. AW advise sewers crossing the site   | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                 | Overhead cables crossing the site.   | Amber                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk   |                       | Available for NR15 1JD area.   | Green                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route  |                       | Not effected.  | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability   | Green                 | Greenfield site with no known issues.  | Green                |
| Flood Risk   | Amber                 | <p>None directly effecting the site</p> <p><b>LFFA</b> - Few or no Constraints.</p>  | Green                |

| Impact   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Type<br>( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )        | Not applicable        | Tributary Farmland   | Not applicable       |
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) |                       | Tas Tributary Farmland   |                      |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                     | Green                 | No designated landscapes.<br><br>Grade 3 Agricultural Lane.  | Green                |
| Townscape  | Amber                 | Frontage development on High Green is generally low density with mature planting and rural in appearance. This development also forms part of the Conservation Area. However moderately higher density estate type development does exist to the rear of properties on the north side of High Green, at Astley Cooper Place, Coniston Road, Brecon Road etc.<br><br>In isolation (without SN2119) this site would be detached from the settlement. | Amber                |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity                                      | Amber                 | No designated sites in close proximity.  | Green                |
| Historic Environment   | Amber                 | Potential impact on the approach to the Conservation Area. Listed buildings in the vicinity, but unlikely to have a direct impact – however this site would require the adjoining site to also come forward (between this site and the village), which has more significant heritage impacts.<br><br><b>HES</b> - Amber  | Amber                |
| Open Space   | Green                 | Not within an identified open space  | Green                |

| Impact                 | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Transport and Roads    | Amber                 | <p>Lack of footway along High Green between the site and Astley Cooper Place. However, the site promoter has suggested that a suitable footway can be accommodated within the existing highway, although the impact on the character of the Conservation Area would need to be considered and this would rely on the adjoining site coming forward.</p> <p>The 30 mph starts in front of the site.</p> <p>Reasonable access to the main B1332.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, not acceptable. Limited forward visibility in vicinity of site &amp; f/w to village centre starts at Astley Cooper Place, not clear that a facility can be provided within the highway in the existing developed area – approx. 200m plus adjacent site frontage of approx. 70m.</p> | Red                  |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green                 | <p>Principally agricultural, however there are several large commercial/agricultural building immensely to the west of the site which are quite a dominant feature.</p>   | Amber                |



#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?  | The site is a reasonable distance from the Conservation Area, however development of this site would rely on the adjoining land (SN2119) between the site and existing development to also being acceptable. Therefore the combined impact of this scale of development would be a consideration. | Not applicable          |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?                                    | 30 mph zone starts partway across the site frontage and would be likely to need relocating.   | Not applicable          |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Greenfield agricultural land, No obvious concerns.  | Not applicable          |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)    | Greenfield/agricultural to the north, east and south. Substantial agricultural/commercial buildings to the west. Depending on the permitted use, these could impact on the amenity of future occupiers of the site, and also form a dominant feature along that boundary.                         | Not applicable          |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)   | Level site, rising slightly away from High Green.   | Not applicable          |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)  | Boundaries to the south, west and north are open, with minimal vegetation. Shallow ditch to the road frontage.<br>Agricultural/commercial buildings effectively from the western boundary.  | Not applicable          |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Minimal vegetation on site, and no features of note.  | Not applicable          |

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|----------------------|
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)                            | Overhead lines running diagonally across the site.<br><br>Greenfield site, therefore unlikely to be contaminated.  | Not applicable       |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | Very open site, views across are dominated by the agricultural/commercial buildings at Wood Farm and the vegetated backdrop of the adjoining site.   | Not applicable       |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | The site itself is a level agricultural site with few features and relatively unconstrained. However, the lack of boundary features means the site is also quite exposed; although the orientation of High Green means that development wouldn't be seen until relatively close to the site.<br><br>The site is detached from the existing settlement, and would therefore not work in townscape terms. The adjoining agricultural/commercial buildings are also a dominant feature. | Amber                |

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| <b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)                                     | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?   | Private   | Not applicable              |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Not being marketed, but promoted on behalf of the owner by an agent with a land sales experience. | Not applicable              |
| When might the site be available for development?   | Immediately. No known legal restrictions to bringing the site forward.                            | Green                       |

| <b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b> |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No)<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Some evidence supplied to address issues raised by the previous GNLP assessment of the site.   | Green                     |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)     | Off-site footways  | Amber                     |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?           | Yes  | Green                     |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                     | Potential primary school, if developed in conjunction with the adjoining SN2122, however, the need for this has not been demonstrated. |                           |

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Although the site is relatively unconstrained, there would be a need to ensure the site could be developed without impacting on the Conservation Area, and provide a suitable footway to access local services and facilities. However, the site would be detached from the existing settlement without the neighbouring site, SN2119, which would result in significantly more development than required.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site itself is a level agricultural site with few features and relatively unconstrained. However, the lack of boundary features means the site is also quite exposed; although the orientation of High Green means that development wouldn't be seen until relatively close to the site.

The site is detached from the existing settlement, and would therefore not work in townscape terms. The adjoining agricultural/commercial buildings are also a dominant feature.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside and detached from the existing Development Boundary.

### **Availability**

Landowner knows of no reason why the site could not be developed immediately, and is being promoted by an agent with a land sales experience.

### **Achievability**

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Unreasonable - The site would be out of keeping without development of the adjoining site (SN2119), and in combination they are too large for the purposes of the VCHAP. Issues regarding the integrating a very exposed/open site with development in this part of the village would remain, as would the need take account of the agricultural/commercial buildings on the western boundary, addressing the highways concerns and the need to provide a footway link to local services and facilities.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: November 2020

## SN2174

### Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail  | Comments  |
|---|---|
| Site Reference  | SN2174  |
| Site address  | Land east of Kirstead Green/south of St Christopher Close   |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status)    |   |
| Planning History  | Most recent 2009/0987 Anglian Water pumping station in the north west corner of the site. 1986 refusal for residential development (in combination with land to the north), prior to 1990 approval of 10 dwellings which form St Christophers Close on the northern part. |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)   | 0.76ha  |
| Promoted Site Use,<br>including<br>(q) Allocated site<br>(r) SL extension | Allocation  |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)    | Up to 20 dwellings at 26/ha.  |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield  | Greenfield (although it contains an Anglian Water pumping station)  |

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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



### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

| <b>Constraint</b>  | <b>HELAA Score<br/>(R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score<br/>(R/ A/ G)</b> |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Access to the site | Amber                            | <p>Access would need to be direct from Kirstead Green, south of the pumping station, involving the removal of frontage hedgerow.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, insufficient frontage to provide vis for an access road. Frontage development with a continuous frontage footway linking with St Christopher's Close may be appropriate in access terms. Site is however considered to be remote/unsustainable without a safe walking route to catchment school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - although there is footway most of the way to Brooke, Highways would not consider this a safe walking route to the School. Would appear difficult to access, a challenge but doable with the removal of hedgerow/trees.</p> | Amber                           |

| Constraint   | HELAA Score<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> | Amber                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brooke Primary School approx. 2,525m</li> <li>• Bus stops (route X41/41/41A Bungay/Poringland/Norwich) - 150m</li> </ul> <p>Some employment opportunities in Brooke within 3km (Park Farm complex, Vets, Care Home etc.)</p> |                         |
| <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>   |                          | None  | Green                   |
| Utilities Capacity   | Green                    | No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed. AW advise sewers crossing the site  | Amber                   |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                    | Pumping station in the north west corner of the site.   | Amber                   |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk   |                          | Available for the NR15 1AE area.  | Green                   |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route  |                          | Not effected.   | Green                   |
| Contamination & ground stability   | Green                    | Agricultural land, with no know issues.   | Green                   |
| Flood Risk   | Amber                    | Central and northern parts of the site affected by surface water flood risk 1:30 years. Larger parts of the site at 1;100year and almost the whole site at 1:1000year   | Amber                   |



| Impact   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Type<br>( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )        | Not applicable        | Tributary Farmland  | Not applicable       |
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) |                       | Chet Tributary Farmland   |                      |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                     | Green                 | <p>No designated landscapes.</p> <p>Relatively well contained site, particularly in the context of the adjoining St Christopher's Close.</p> <p>Grade 3 Agricultural Land</p> <p><b>SNC Landscape Meeting</b> - significant landscape concerns; issues with hedgerow loss and loss of oak trees on the road frontage.</p> | Amber                |
| Townscape  | Green                 | <p>Likely to be similar in form to the adjoining development.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> - No real heritage or townscape issues with St Christopher's Close to the north.</p>  | Green                |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity                                      | Amber                 | <p>Nearest designated site is a CWS at Green Man Lane, approx. 750m away. Potential loss of trees/hedgerow on the site frontage.</p>  | Green                |
| Historic Environment   | Green                 | <p>No designated heritage assets close to the site.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> - No real heritage or townscape issues with St Christopher's Close to the north.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>  | Green                |
| Open Space   | Green                 | Not within an identified open space   | Green                |

| Impact                 | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Transport and Roads    | Green                 | <p>Kirstead Green appears to be the former main road, and is therefore wide with some footways. This links to the main B1332 Norwich/Bungay road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, insufficient frontage to provide vis for an access road. Frontage development with a continuous frontage footway linking with St Christopher’s Close may be appropriate in access terms. Site is however considered to be remote/unsustainable without a safe walking route to catchment school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - although there is footway most of the way to Brooke, Highways would not consider this a safe walking route to the School. Would appear difficult to access, a challenge but doable with the removal of hedgerow/trees.</p> | Red                  |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green                 | Residential to the north, with pumping station in the northwest corner. Agricultural to the to the south and east. Recreation field to the west (opposite side of Kirstead Green)  | Green                |

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations   | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?   | The main impact would be the urbanising effect of a development of 20 dwellings in this location; however a smaller scale/lower density 12 unit scheme would be in keeping with the adjoining St Christopher's Close. | Not applicable       |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?  | Site has a frontage to Kirstead Green, but almost certainly need the removal of most frontage hedging.  | Not applicable       |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)  | Agricultural.   | Not applicable       |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)   | Predominantly late C20th residential and arable agriculture, therefore no obvious issues.   | Not applicable       |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)  | Appears level.  | Not applicable       |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)   | Hedging to the road frontage and south and east. More domestic scale boundaries to the existing dwellings to the north.   | Not applicable       |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?  | One large tree within the site, and substantial hedging on some 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) | Pumping station in the north west corner, the route of associated infrastructure is not currently know - Anglian Water response needed.   | Not applicable       |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape  | Views into the site from Kirstead Green to the south are largely shielded by the existing hedging. The most prominent views would be from the adjoining properties to the north.                                      | Not applicable       |

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|----------------------|
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Generally a well contained site, although it would be more prominent with the removal of frontage hedging and the scale proposed is probably too large/dense for the locality. Although there are footways on large stretches of the B1332 to Brooke, there are some gaps, and the path is narrow in relation to the speed of passing traffic. However the site does have good access to the Bungay/Norwich bus service (via Brooke and Poringland/Framingham Earl). | Amber                |

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Open Countryside                  |  |                      |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                 | Kirstead does not currently have a Development Boundary. | Amber                |

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| <b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)                                     | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?   | Private   | Not applicable              |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | No, although the site is promoted by an agent who states that there have been previous expressions of interest. | Not applicable              |
| When might the site be available for development?   | Immediately   | Green                       |

| <b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b> |
|--|---|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No)<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Agent states that the required affordable housing, open space and possible off-site footway enhancements could be provided. |                           |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)     | Possible footways enhancements.   |                           |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?           | Yes.  |                           |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                     | Management regime for the existing planting around the site.  |                           |

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is relatively unconstrained, apart from the presence of surface water flood risk of varying degrees affecting most of the site, including 1:30 year in the central and northern parts. The site is also at the limits of the distance to services, and unlikely to be attractive to walk/cycle to Brooke on the main B road, however, the site has good access to the X41/41/41A bus service. The pumping station in the northwest corner of the site may also constrain development, although it is already in close proximity to the housing in St Christopher's Close.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Generally a well contained site, although it would be more prominent with the removal of frontage hedging and the scale proposed is probably too large/dense for the locality. Although there are footways on large stretches of the B1332 to Brooke, the path is narrow in relation to the speed of passing traffic. However the site does have good access to the Bungay/Norwich bus service (via Brooke and Poringland/Framingham Earl).

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside and Kirstead does not currently have a Development Boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoted on behalf of the sole land owner for immediate use.

### **Achievability**

Agent indicated (in 2018) that the site was viable and deliverable, and that there has been previous interest for developers.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Unreasonable** - The site itself is constrained primarily by the pumping station on site and the presence of surface water flood risk, otherwise it is a relatively well contained site. The loss of frontage hedgerows and trees would be a concern. Whilst at some distance from services and facilities, and therefore unlikely to encourage walking/cycling, it does have good access to the Bungay/Norwich bus service. Kirstead has not had a Development Boundary since the 1994 Local Plan and would require one to be reinstated for this site to be included.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: November 2020

SN4004

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail  | Comments   |
|---|--|
| Site Reference  | SN4004   |
| Site address  | West of Kirstead Green   |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status)    |  |
| Planning History  | 2019/2219/PIP for 5 dwellings refused, this was a resubmission of a 2018 application for 3 dwellings on the same site, also refused. |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)   | 0.78ha   |
| Promoted Site Use,<br>including<br>(s) Allocated site<br>(t) SL extension | Allocation   |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)    | Minimum of 12 dwellings at 15 dwellings/ha   |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield  | Greenfield   |

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

| <b>Constraint</b>  | <b>HELAA Score<br/>(R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score<br/>(R/ A/ G)</b> |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Access to the site | Green                            | Site has a long frontage, with access direct to Kirstead Green.<br><br><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, subject to acceptable access. Whilst f/w can be provided to village, safe walking route not available to school, remote settlement with limited facilities, sustainability concern.<br><br><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> – although there is footway most of the way to Brooke, Highways would not consider this a safe walking route to the School. The site itself does not appear to have any overriding constraint to access. | <b>Amber</b>                    |



| Constraint   | HELAA Score<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> | Green                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brooke Primary School approx. 2,525m</li> <li>• Bus stops (route X41/41/41A Bungay/Poringland/Norwich) - 150m</li> </ul> <p>Some employment opportunities in Brooke within 3km (Park Farm complex, Vets, Care Home etc.)</p> |                         |
| <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>   |                          | None  | Green                   |
| Utilities Capacity   | Green                    | No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.   | Amber                   |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                    | No known constraints.   | Green                   |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk   |                          | Available for the NR15 1AE area.  | Green                   |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route  |                          | Not effected.   | Green                   |
| Contamination & ground stability   | Green                    | Former informal play area, no known constraints.  | Green                   |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Flood Risk | Amber                 | <p>Surface Water Flood Risk 1:30 year on parts of the site closest to the existing dwellings, extending out to the majority of the developable area of the site at 1:1000 year.</p> <p><b>LFFA</b> - Mitigation required for heavy constraints</p> | Amber                |

| Impact   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )           | Not applicable        | Tributary Farmland  | Not applicable       |
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) |                       | Chet Tributary Farmland   |                      |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                     | Green                 | <p>No designated landscapes.</p> <p>Relatively well contained site, although the extent of this would depend on the amount of vegetation what required removal to achieve a suitable access.</p>  | Green                |
| Townscape  | Amber                 | Would extend development further south than the current built area of the village, raised as a concern in refusing the Permission in Principle  | Amber                |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity                                      | Amber                 | <p>Nearest designated site is a CWS at Green Man Lane, approx. 800m away. Potential loss of trees/hedgerow on the site frontage.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecology</b> - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity net Gain</p> | Amber                |

| Impact                 | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Historic Environment   | Amber                 | No designated heritage assets close to the site; however, the carriageway of the B1332 immediately to the west is highlighted as a site of archeological interest.<br><br>HES - Amber  | Amber                |
| Open Space             | Amber                 | Site was previously informal open space, although the submission states that it is now 'surplus to requirements'.  | Amber                |
| Transport and Roads    | Amber                 | Kirstead Green appears to be the former main road, and is therefore wide with some footways. This links to the main B1332 Norwich/Bungay road.<br><br>NCC Highways – Red, subject to acceptable access. Whilst f/w can be provided to village, safe walking route not available to school, remote settlement with limited facilities, sustainability concern.<br><br>NCC Highways Meeting – although there is footway most of the way to Brooke, Highways would not consider this a safe walking route to the School. The site itself does not appear to have any overriding constraint to access. | Amber                |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green                 | Residential to the north, separated by a footpath. Roads to the other boundaries, with agricultural land beyond.   | Green                |

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations   | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?   | Currently there is an end to development on both sides of Kirstead Green at this point, and whilst the older housing has a generally linear form, this would be a ribbon of infill between the old main road and the B1332. | Not applicable          |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?   | Site had a long and relatively straight frontage, all within a 30mph area, therefore access would appear possible.  | Not applicable          |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)  | Small field, previously used as a kickabout play area.  | Not applicable          |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)   | Dwellings to the north, otherwise sandwiched between two road, with arable land beyond.   | Not applicable          |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)  | Appears generally flat/level.   | Not applicable          |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)   | Heavily vegetated to the B1332 boundary, likely to need retaining for amenity purposes. More sparse, but still continuous hedge to the Kirstead Green frontage.   | Not applicable          |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?  | Hedgerow would need assessment, but scale would indicate they   | Not applicable          |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | Greenfield site,.   | Not applicable          |

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | The site is generally well enclosed, with no views in/out from the B1332. Removal hedging to create access to Klrstead Green would give clear views in/out, also views from the footpath and dwellings to the north.              | Not applicable       |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | A reasonably well contained site, with substantial vegetation screening to the B1332. Would be a clear ribbon development of the village beyond the current edge, which is quite clearly defined on both sides of Kirstead Green. | Amber                |

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments                                   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Open Countryside                  |  |                      |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                 | No current development Limit for Kirstead. | Amber                |

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| <b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)                                     | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?   | Private   | Not applicable              |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Not currently marketed, but promoted by an agent on behalf of the owners. | Not applicable              |
| When might the site be available for development?   | Immediately   | Green                       |

| <b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b> |
|--|---|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No)<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | No abnormal costs identified.   | Green                     |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)     | None known.   | Amber                     |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?           | Promoter has confirmed, but no supporting evidence.   | Amber                     |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                     | Retention of 0.22ha of open space - although it is not clear what the proposed use would be, or how any ongoing costs would be met. |                           |

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Kirstead is a smaller hamlet, with no local facilities of its own, however it is well connected by bus service on the main Bungay/Brooke/Poringland/Norwich route. Whilst there is a footway for much of the route to Brooke, NCC do not consider this a safe route to the catchment school. Distance to services and the breakout in the form of ribbon development were reasons for refusal for two recent Permission in Principle applications. Surface water flood risk is an identified issue on the part of the site beset related to existing development.

### **Site Visit Observations**

A reasonably well contained site, with substantial vegetation screening to the B1332. Would be a clear ribbon development of the village beyond the current edge, which is quite clearly defined on both sides of Kirstead Green.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside, and Kirstead does not currently have defined Settlement Limit.

### **Availability**

Promoted on behalf of the owner, who has made two recent PiP applications.

### **Achievability**

No known obstacles to achievability, subject to addressing the surface water flooding issue.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Unreasonable** - The site itself is constrained primarily by the presence of surface water flood risk and the ribbon form of development which extends beyond the current well edge of the settlement, otherwise it is a relatively well contained site. The loss of frontage hedgerow would be a concern, and the vegetation to the B1332 boundary would need to be retained for visual containment and amenity. Whilst at some distance from services and facilities, and therefore unlikely to encourage walking/cycling, it does have good access to the Bungay/Norwich bus service. Kirstead has not had a Development Boundary since the 1994 Local Plan and would require one to be reinstated for this site to be included.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: November 2020

SN4047

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail  | Comments  |
|---|---|
| Site Reference  | SN4047  |
| Site address  | East of Old Hall Gardens/Brooke Flock Farm, Brooke  |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status)    | None.   |
| Planning History  | Application for a single dwelling on plot overlapping the northeast corner of the site, withdrawn (2016/1830) |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)   | 1.8ha   |
| Promoted Site Use,<br>including<br>(u) Allocated site<br>(v) SL extension | Allocation  |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)    | Promoted density 14 to 19 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<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Access to the site | Amber                    | <p>The submission suggests access via Old Hall Gardens, although the cul-de-sac currently appears to end either at mature trees (possibly within the Conservation Area or covered by Brooke Old Hall group TPO), or an area maintained as domestic garden; therefore it is not clear whether the site promoter has rights of access at this point.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, access &amp; network not acceptable.</p> | Red                     |

| Constraint   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> |                       | <p>Walking/cycling distances measured assuming access via Old Hall Gardens.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary School - 1,475m</li> <li>• Shop/Post Office/Garage - 1,375m</li> <li>• Park Farm complex - 1,625m</li> <li>• Bus - The Street bus stop, service 41 - 700m</li> <li>• Brooke Industrial Park - 2,025m (via Entrance Lane, over 3,000m via The Street/Norwich Road)</li> </ul> <p>Various other small scale employment opportunities in the vicinity - inc. vets, care home etc.</p> |                      |
| <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>   |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village Hall (with community cafe and recreation facilities) - 1,575m</li> <li>• Pub (White Lion) - 850m</li> <li>Brooke Cricket Club - 1,600m</li> </ul>  | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity   | Amber                 | No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed. AW advise sewers crossing the site  | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                 | None identified on/close to the site.   | Green                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk   |                       | Available for the NR15 1JZ area.  | Green                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route  |                       | Not effected  | Green                |

| Constraint                       | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Contamination & ground stability | Green                 | Greenfield site with no known issues.<br><br><b>NCC Mineral &amp; Waste</b> - sites over 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy. | Green                |
| Flood Risk                       | Amber                 | Small area of surface water flood risk (inc 1:30 years) at the entrance in the in the northwest corner of the site.<br><br><b>LLFA</b> - Few or no constraints.   | Amber                |

| Impact   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )           | Not applicable        | Tributary Farmland   | Not applicable       |
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) |                       | Chet Tributary Farmland  |                      |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                     | Green                 | No designated landscapes.<br><br>However the development would be an uncharacteristic extension into the attractive countryside setting of Brooke, visible from Brooke footpath 7, to the south.   | Amber                |
| Townscape  | Amber                 | Whilst the site is between Old Hall Gardens and Brooke Flock Farm, it would represent a spur out into the countryside with is not characteristic of this side of The Street and it is not clear how the development could be well integrated with this part of Brooke. | Amber                |

| Impact                      | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Amber                 | <p>Kirstead Hall Wood County Wildlife Site to the south. Not immediately affected by this site, but would need to consider whether any priority species might be affected, given the possible links to other wooded areas surrounding the site.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecology</b> - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>  | Amber                |
| Historic Environment        | Amber                 | <p>The site immediately adjoins the Conservation Area along the western boundary, and is in the immediate vicinity are the Grade 2* listed St Peter's Church and the old vicarage (both within 150m). Whilst Dovecote Close and Old Hall Gardens already enclose the setting of the church, and the development would (at least for part of the year) be separated from the church by a belt to trees, development of this site would still encroach further on the setting of the church. At least four other listed buildings/structures are within 250m of the site, including the war memorial in the churchyard.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p> | Amber                |
| Open Space                  | Green                 | Not within an identified open space.  | Green                |
| Transport and Roads         | Green                 | <p>If connection to Old Hall Gardens can be achieved, the site would have reasonable access to The Street and Entrance Lane, which connect to the B1332 Norwich Road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, access &amp; network not acceptable.</p>  | Red                  |
| Neighbouring Land Uses      | Green                 | Low density residential to the west, agricultural to the remaining boundaries.  | Green                |

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations   | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|--|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?   | Although screened by the Brooke Hall TPO tree area, the site could potentially impact on the setting of the Grade 2* listed St Peter's Church and adjoining listed old vicarage, as well as the Conservation Area more widely. In townscape terms the site makes an uncharacteristic break out from the pattern of development on the east side of The Street, which would be visible from nearby footpath Brooke 7 and 8. | Not applicable       |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?                                    | It is not clear whether the site can be readily accessed from Old Hall Gardens, as suggested by the submission, as the ends of the existing cul-de-sac are affected by either trees (potentially within the Conservation Area/covered by a group TPO) or are set out as domestic garden. The existing access to Brooke Flock Farm would not be suitable.   | Not applicable       |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)  | Greenfield arable land.  | Not applicable       |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Neighbouring uses are either existing residential and the church to the west, or agricultural land to the other three boundaries, with no obvious compatibility issues.  | Not applicable       |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)                                      | Generally level.   | Not applicable       |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)                                       | Dense TPO trees and lower level domestic curtilages to the western boundary, open boundaries on the other aspects, with no clearly defined boundary to the south.  | Not applicable       |

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?   | Protection would be needed for the mature TPO trees adjoining the site; given the extensive areas of trees in the vicinity of the site, and the small lake to the south east, there is the potential for impacts on ecology of developing the site.   | Not applicable       |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)                            | Greenfield site, therefore unlikely to be contaminated.   | Not applicable       |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | Public views of the site are more limited when vegetation is in leaf, however the site would be viewed from Old Hall Gardens, from the churchyard and from the public footpaths to the south. The site is an open agricultural field within a wider, gently rolling landscape, enclosed by pockets of woodland.   | Not applicable       |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Whilst the site itself has few constraints, there are a number of potential issues relating to: access, which would need to be secured from Old Hall Gardens; heritage impact on the Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings/structures, including the Grade 2* St Peter's Church; townscape/landscape effect of breaking out on the east side of The Street (particularly in terms of taking a partial field with no obvious southern boundary); ecology related to the adjoining TPOed woodland (and any relationship to other woodland and the nearby lake). | Amber                |

## Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Open Countryside                  |   |                      |
| Conservation Area                 |   |                      |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                 | Small part of the western boundary adjoins the existing Development Boundary. | 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                                 | 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. In two related ownerships. | 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, only brief assessment of the site has been put forward in the site submission. | Amber              |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)  | None known.  | Green              |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?        | Yes.   | Green              |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                  | No.  |                    |

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is a level, greenfield site within a reasonable distance of most village services/facilities, there are also a number of issues related to: securing the access; heritage impact on the Conservation Area/listed building (including the 2\* St Peter's church within 150m); landscape and townscape concerns of breaking out on the eastern side of The Street; and ecology related to Kirstead Hall CWS and any relationship to the wider wooded landscape.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Whilst the site itself has few constraints, there are a number of potential issues relating to: access, which would need to be secured from Old Hall Gardens; heritage impact on the Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings/structures, including the Grade 2\* St Peter's Church; townscape/landscape effect of breaking out on the east side of The Street (particularly in terms of taking a partial field with no obvious southern boundary); ecology related to the adjoining TPOed woodland (and any relationship to other woodland and the nearby lake).

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside, a small part of the western boundary of the site adjoins the existing Development Boundary, although this has clearly been drawn tightly around existing development.

### **Availability**

Available, although in two related ownerships.

### **Achievability**

No formal appraisal has been undertaken and it is not clear if access rights to Old Hall Gardens exist.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Unreasonable - of most village services/facilities and with few constraints as an arable greenfield site, there are a number of concerns particularly re. achieving suitable access, heritage impact on the Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings, landscape/townscape impact and ecology re the adjoining TPOed woodland and wider wooded landscape.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: December 2020



## SN4065SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail  | Comments                             |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Site Reference  | SN4065SL                             |
| Site address  | Adj Oaklands, Honey Pot Lane, Brooke |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status)    | None.                                |
| Planning History  | No recent relevant history.          |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)   | 0.43ha                               |
| Promoted Site Use,<br>including<br>(w) Allocated site<br>(x) SL extension | SL extension for one dwelling.       |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)    | 2 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 field access, assume similar access to dwellings on either side; however, direct on to 60mph road.<br><br><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, access & network not acceptable. No walking route to school.   | Red                  |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary School - 1,650m</li> <li>• Shop/Post Office/Garage - 1,750m</li> <li>• Park Farm complex - 1,475m</li> <li>• Bus (King's Head stops, services inc X41 Bungay/Norwich) - 1,775m</li> </ul> <p>Various other small scale employment opportunities in the Brooke - inc. vets, care home etc.</p> |                      |

| Constraint  | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| <i>Part 2:</i><br>Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul> |                       | Pub (King's Head – currently being renovated/extended) - 1,775m  | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity  | Amber                 | No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.  | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure  | Green                 | Telegraph wires crossing the front of the site; however these also cross the front of neighbouring residential properties.   | Green                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk  |                       | Under consideration for further upgrades for the NR15 1HA area.  | Amber                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route   |                       | Not effected.  | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability  | Green                 | Greenfield garden plot with no known issues.   | Green                |
| Flood Risk  | Amber                 | 1:30 year surface water hazard in the middle of the site. Wider area at 1:100 year surface water risk.<br>Majority of the site at 1:1000 year surface water flood risk.<br><br><b>LLFA</b> - Significant mitigation required for severe constraints. | Amber                |

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

| Impact   | HELAA Score<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) |                          | Tas Tributary Farmland  |                         |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                     | Green                    | No designated landscapes.   | Green                   |
| Townscape  | Amber                    | Small group of three of four houses, approx. 675m from the edge of the main built area of the settlement.   | Amber                   |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity                                      | Amber                    | <p>The site is long the opposite side of Honey Pot Lane (less than 25m) from Brooke Wood, which is both a CWS and Ancient Woodland.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecology</b> - SSSI IRZ. Opposite side of road to Brooke Wood Ancient Woodland and CWS. Potential for protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>   | Amber                   |
| Historic Environment   | Amber                    | <p>The Old Farmhouse and Old Farmhouse Barn at the junction with Woodton Road, are approximately 150m south of the site. The Old Farmhouse site also includes a site of Archeological interest.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>   | Amber                   |
| Open Space   | Green                    | Not within an identified open space   | Green                   |
| Transport and Roads  | Amber                    | <p>The site is approximately 725m from the nearest footways linking to services and facilities in Brooke. Access would be required onto a section of road under the national speed limit, and the majority of the distance to Brooke is also covered by the 60mph limit.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, access &amp; network not acceptable. No walking route to school.</p> | Red                     |

| Impact                    | HELAA Score<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Neighbouring<br>Land Uses | Green                    | The site is between two residential properties, with agricultural land to the rear (east) and Brooke Wood opposite (west). | Green                   |

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations   | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?   | The site would infill a small site between two existing properties. However these are some distance from the settlement and Old House Farm and the associated Barn, approx. 175m to the south, are both listed. | Not applicable          |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?   | existing field access onto High Green, between the accesses to two neighbouring properties.   | Not applicable          |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)  | Paddock with stables/outbuildings.  | Not applicable          |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)   | Residential to the either side (south and north), Ancient Woodland on the opposite side of the road (west) and agricultural to the rear (east)  | Not applicable          |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)  | Level site.   | Not applicable          |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)   | Site appears to be fenced in. Hedging to the road frontage and the rear (south and west). More mature trees to the east and north.  | Not applicable          |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?  | Mature tress on the site boundary, although these may be outside the proposed site itself.  | Not applicable          |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | Greenfield site with no apparent issues.  | Not applicable          |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape  | Site is generally well contained, depending on how it was developed, potentially visible from Woodton Road, but in the context of neighbouring buildings.   | Not applicable          |

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|----------------------|
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Small relatively well contained site, potentially suitable for small infill development. Opposite Brooke Wood which is both Ancient Woodland and CWS. However, the site is remote from the village, on unlit, 60mph roads, with no footways. | Amber                |

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| <b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)                                     | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?   | Private  | Not applicable              |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | No. Site is promoted by the owner for a self-build Passivhaus. | Not applicable              |
| When might the site be available for development?   | Immediately  | Green                       |

| <b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b> |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No)<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Evidence of utilities and related to previous searches for the site. | Amber                     |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)     | Unlikely   | Green                     |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?           | Not applicable to the scale of site/proposal                         | Green                     |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                     | None.  |                           |



## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

A small, relatively well contained site for infill. However, the centre of the site is identified as being at surface water flood risk (1:30 year), with reduced levels of risk on wider areas of the site. The site is at the limit in terms of access to services. The site is opposite Brooke Wood CWS and Ancient Woodland.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Small relatively well contained site, potentially suitable for small infill development. Opposite Brooke Wood which is both Ancient Woodland and CWS. However, the site is remote from the village, on unlit, 60mph roads, with no footways.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside, and significantly detached from the Development Boundary. Opposite CWS/Ancient Woodland.

### **Availability**

Site Owner promoting for self-build.

### **Achievability**

Site Owner promoting for self-build.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Unreasonable** - The site is over 1km from the Settlement Limit for Brooke and more than 1.5km from all of the key services and facilities, on an unlit, 60mph road, with no footways. The site is also identified as being at surface water flood risk and is in the immediate vicinity of Brooke Wood Ancient Woodland/County Wildlife Site.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: November 2020

## SN5016SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail  | Comments  |
|---|---|
| Site Reference  | SN5016SL  |
| Site address  | Land east of The Green, Howe  |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status)    | Outside development boundary  |
| Planning History  | 1988/0818/F for 1 dwelling refused 12/05/1988, appeal dismissed 09/11/1988. Numerous applications earlier in same decade. |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)   | 0.48  |
| Promoted Site Use,<br>including<br>(y) Allocated site<br>(z) SL extension | SL extension<br><br>However, there is no SL for Howe.   |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)    | 5; conversion of barns to 2 units and new build for 3<br>12 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                 | Has road frontage and a small break in the hedge for access to the barns. In order to achieve visibility splays some of the hedge would need to be removed.<br><br><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Access would require substantial mature hedge/tree removal & road alignment challenging. Remote, network poor, no footway to school.  | Red                  |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> | Red                   | <p>Howe does not have any core services. The nearest are in Brooke and Poringland.</p> <p>Limited local employment to the north; 1,300m</p> <p>Brooke Primary School; 2,300m<br/>Poringland Primary School; 2,800m<br/>High school over 3,000m</p> <p>Bus stop on B1332; 1,000m</p> <p>All accessed along narrow, unlit roads with no footpath and then onto the B1332.</p> | N/A                  |

| Constraint  | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| <i>Part 2:</i><br>Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul> | N/A                   | Brooke Village Hall; 2,000m<br><br>Brooke Post Office; 2,200m  | Amber                |
| Utilities Capacity  | Amber                 | No known capacity issues<br><br><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green   | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure  | Amber                 | Owner indicates that the site has access to mains water and electricity.   | Amber                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk  | N/A                   | Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.   | Green                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route   | N/A                   | Not within identified cable route or substation location.  | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability  | Amber                 | Existing agricultural buildings so would need investigation.   | Amber                |
| Flood Risk  | Amber                 | Flood Zone 1.<br>1:100 Medium risk of surface water flooding, pond on site and to the north.<br><br><b>LLFA:</b> Green. At risk of surface water flooding. On-site flood risk is concentrated to a pond feature. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.<br><br><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green | Amber                |

| Impact   | HELAA Score<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| SN Landscape Type<br>( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )        | N/A                      | Tributary Farmland  | N/A                     |
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) | N/A                      | B1 Tas Tributary Farmland<br><br>Agricultural Land Classification;<br>Grade 2 Very good (Light Blue)  | N/A                     |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                     | Red                      | The site does not encroach into the open countryside because of the delineated eastern field boundary. However, it forms part of the landscape character of the village and would detract from the wider setting of Howe and the Howe conservation area. Would be public views from the public footpath across the field from the east.   | Red                     |
| Townscape  | Red                      | There is no development boundary for Howe as it is a small, undeveloped rural hamlet with a very distinct historic character and no recent housing. The site is mainly within the conservation area, western part to the road frontage, and adds a great deal in its current form by way of a green space. Development here would be severely detrimental to the built form, townscape and conservation area. It would also impact on the listed church opposite and necessitate the removal of an established hedge. | Red                     |

| Impact                      | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Amber                 | <p>No designations. Undeveloped land, grass with old barns therefore potential for habitats including bats. Further investigation would be required.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Green.</p> <p>Any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m<sup>3</sup>/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream requires consultation with Natural England. Pond adjacent to site boundary- site partially with amber risk zone for great crested newts. not in GI corridor.</p> <p>Footpath Howe FP3 passes through site.</p> | Amber                |
| Historic Environment        | Red                   | <p>In the Howe Conservation Area. Listed buildings – Grade II* Church opposite. Possible archaeological interest. Non-designated heritage asset to north, thatched cottage and old school house.</p> <p>New development would significantly impact on the heritage assets.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>   | Red                  |
| Open Space                  | Green                 | No   | Green                |
| Transport and Roads         | Amber                 | <p>Narrow rural roads running through Howe, which is a relatively isolated hamlet. There are no paths and the road is not lit so walking to services would be unrealistic.</p> <p>Prow to south running eastwards (FP3).</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Access would require substantial mature hedge/tree removal &amp; road alignment challenging. Remote, network poor, no footway to school.</p>  | Amber                |

| Impact                    | HELAA Score<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Neighbouring<br>Land Uses | Green                    | Dwelling to the north, School<br>Cottage, and cottages to the south.<br>Church opposite to the south-west<br>and agricultural field to the east<br>boundary, | Green                   |

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations   | Comments<br>(Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?   | Any new development (aside from conversion of existing buildings) would severely impact on the heritage of the area – the conservation area and the listed church.  | N/A                     |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?   | There is an existing gap in the hedge to access the barns on the site, but this would need to be improved to get visibility which would mean removing part of the hedge.<br><br>It is a very narrow rural road. There is informal parking for the church directly opposite the existing access point. | N/A                     |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)  | Unused grass land with some old storage buildings.  | N/A                     |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)   | Dwelling to north-west and to the south.<br>Agricultural to east.<br>Churchyard opposite.   | 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 on boundary, some trees.   | N/A                     |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?  | Pond on site and one close to north, potential for wildlife there and within the site. Also could be bat roosts within existing old buildings and given the mature trees within the churchyard.   | 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) | Unknown, but would need investigation for contamination because of storage buildings.<br><br>Telephone wires across the front.  | N/A                     |



| Site Visit Observations  | Comments<br>(Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | Views into and out of the site are limited because of vegetation; trees and established hedge. However this would be opened up for access and there would be views above the hedge of development.   | N/A                     |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Do not consider this is an acceptable site for new build residential development. This is because of the impact on the heritage assets (designated and non-designated) and the significant affect it would have on the un-developed nature of the village and its distinct rural character in close proximity to the listed church. It is also very remote from all essential services which would mean that these would be almost entirely accessed by car. | 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<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Conservation Area                 |  | N/A                     |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                 | Negative impact on the Conservation Area | Red                     |

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

| <b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b> |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No)<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Likely to be deliverable although no evidence submitted.                                   | Amber                     |
| 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?           | Indicated yes although it is under the threshold with the proposed numbers and conversion. | Red                       |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                     | No   | N/A                       |

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Howe is a rural hamlet with no currently defined Settlement Limit, as such any proposals would need to the creation of a new Limit, for which there are currently no plans. The site has a number of limitations. It is at the margins in terms of distance to services and the issue is compounded by the local road network being narrow, unlit, with no footways and much of it at the national speed limit. The site itself is within the Conservation Area and opposite the Grade II\* listed church and would require the loss of significant frontage hedging/trees to create a suitable access; substantially changing the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the church and other non-designated heritage assets.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Do not consider this is an acceptable site for new build residential development. This is because of the impact on the heritage assets (designated and non-designated) and the significant affect it would have on the un-developed nature of the village and its distinct rural character in close proximity to the listed church. It is also very remote from all essential services which would mean that these would be almost entirely accessed by car.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Concern over the impact on the Conservation Area.

### **Availability**

Site promoter has indicated the site would be available immediately once it has been cleared.

### **Achievability**

Site promoters has indicated the site is deliverable, but no supporting evidence has been submitted.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The proposal is for a Settlement Limit extension in a location which currently has no Limit, and no plans to put one in place. Howe itself has no local services/facilities other than the church. Services are at the margins in terms of distance and the issue is compounded by the local road network being narrow, unlit, with no footways and much of it at the national speed limit, severely limiting the transport options. Creation of a suitable access and development of the site would impact detrimentally on the Conservation Area, the setting of the Grade II\* listed church opposite and the other nearby non-designated heritage assets. There is also the potential for the loss of habitat in the old barn structures within a site bounded by trees/hedges.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 29/04/2022

## SN5058

### Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail  | Comments  |
|---|---|
| Site Reference  | SN5058  |
| Site address  | Brooke Lodge, west of Norwich Road, NR15 1JG  |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status)      | Outside development boundary - unallocated  |
| Planning History  | Various historic applications including;<br>1997/0358 New access to north.<br>2012/0308/RVC Agricultural occupancy restriction removed on bungalow. |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)   | Whole site: 7.3ha   |
| Promoted Site Use,<br>including<br>(aa) Allocated site<br>(bb) SL extension | Allocation  |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)      | Promoted for an assisted living residential development for older people with medical facilities and a community garden.                            |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield  | Brownfield  |

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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



### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

| <b>Constraint</b>   | <b>HELAA Score<br/>(R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score<br/>(R/ A/ G)</b> |
|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Access to the site  | Amber                            | Frontage to the B1332 Norwich Road with two separate accesses to the north of the site.  | Amber                           |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> | Green                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary School - 825m</li> <li>• Shop/Post Office/Garage - 775</li> <li>• Park Farm complex – 1,100m</li> <li>• Employment - (Brooke Industrial Park) - 1,125m</li> <li>• Bus - Kings Head bus stop (41/X41 services) - 700m</li> </ul> <p>Various other small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity (vet, care home etc.)</p> |                                 |

| Constraint   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| <b>Part 2:</b><br>Part 1 facilities, plus<br>○ Village/ community hall<br>○ Public house/ café<br>○ Preschool facilities<br>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village Hall (with recreation facilities and community cafe) - 650m</li> <li>Pub (Kings Head – currently being refurbished) - 700m (White Lion also within 2km)</li> </ul> Brooke Cricket Club – 1,150m | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity   | Green                 | Promoter stated no specific known constraints.   | Green                |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                 | Promoter stated no specific known constraints.   | Green                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk   |                       | Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.   | Green                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route  |                       | Not within identified cable route or substation location.  | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability   | Green                 | No known issues.   | Green                |
| Flood Risk   | Green                 | Flood Zone 1<br>Some very small pockets of surface water flooding within the site.   | Green                |

| Impact   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )           | Not applicable        | Tributary Farmland   | Not applicable       |
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) |                       | B1 - Tas Tributary Farmland.<br><br>B5 – Chet Tributary Farmland lies to the east across the B1332 |                      |

| Impact                       | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green                 | <p>No designated landscapes.</p> <p>The landscape is open with large fields however this is a contained site, within its own substantial mature boundaries, which hides the buildings but makes it a feature in the landscape as a wooded area.</p> <p>Grade 3 Agricultural Land.</p>              | Amber                |
| Townscape                    | Amber                 | <p>Would extend the growth of Brooke towards Poringland, particularly if the proposed site to the south is developed.</p> <p>This is a specific proposal for a community housing facility and would be considered as a separate, discrete development within its own grounds.</p>                  | Amber                |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity  | Green                 | No designated sites in close proximity.  | Green                |
| Historic Environment         | Amber                 | <p>Brooke Lodge is a Grade II Listed Building and is within the site. It has a woodland setting which would need to be retained and the impact of development assessed.</p> <p>Distant views of the Brooke Conservation Area from Norwich Road.</p> <p>Archaeological record west of the site.</p> | Amber                |
| Open Space                   | Green                 | Not within an identified open space  | Green                |
| Transport and Roads          | Green                 | Frontage to the B1332 Norwich Road and footpaths to the main village services and facilities.  | Amber                |
| Neighbouring Land Uses       | Green                 | Agriculture.   | Green                |





Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?  | <p>Brooke Lodge is a listed building within grounds which are heavily treed. Development would affect its setting.</p> <p>Some possible impact on distant views of Brooke Conservation Area, although these would appear to be very limited, and the site would remain contained within its wooded setting.</p> <p>Extends the settlement development northwards towards Poringland although this sits as a separate, contained site.</p> | Not applicable          |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?                                    | Direct access to the B1332, may require speed reduction measures.   | Not applicable          |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | The site consists of a Grade II listed country house, a range of offices and a warehouse used by a printing business. There is also a separate bungalow and a range of glasshouses.   | Not applicable          |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)    | Agricultural on all sides. No compatibility issues.   | Not applicable          |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)   | The site is level.  | Not applicable          |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)  | The site has strong boundaries on all sides which mean it is largely not visible from the B1332.  | Not applicable          |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | There are significant mature trees within the site which are the setting for the listed building and mature native hedges surrounding. This would provide significant 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)                            | Residential use unlikely to be contaminated but have been other uses of the buildings over the years which would need to be checked.<br><br>Overhead wires run outside to the south of 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 into and out of the site are limited due to its containment. The location of the site as a whole is visible in the open landscape as a wooded area and development would be seen without this level of landscaping.  | Not applicable       |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | <p>The site is contained and there are no views inside the site because of the level of landscaping. The site is visible when travelling along the B1332 through Brooke and across the wider open agricultural countryside from the footpath network.</p> <p>It is well located in terms of access to services and facilities, and with direct access to the B1332. However, it is not adjacent to existing development and needs to be considered in conjunction with the proposed sites to the south.</p> <p>In addition, this proposal is not for open market housing it is for a residential/older persons facility which needs to be considered. The usual route for this type of proposal is through a planning application.</p> | Amber                |

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| 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 – single owner | 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) | Site is in a single ownership and the promoter has confirmed that there are no issues that would impede development. This is the initial stage, and no developer has been identified yet. The proposal is to phase the scheme. | Amber              |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)  | Site owner controls the whole site, therefore land for open space/GI could be made available if required.<br><br>Highway works to reduce speeds on the B1332 may be required.  | Amber              |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?        | No   | Red                |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?                                  | The proposal is for a private assisted living housing with supporting facilities. It does not specify whether any of these would be available for the local community.   |                    |

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is relatively well located in terms of access to services and is linked by a footpath. However, it is a large site and is separate to the existing village development.

The land has been promoted for a care community, providing specialist housing of a scale that is not considered appropriate within the this plan.

The site may be suitable for some specialist development, subject to no overriding concerns regarding the impact on the listed building and its setting, impact on mature trees and suitable access arrangements from the B1332.

### **Site Visit Observations**

A contained, level site with mature trees and hedges providing the setting for a listed building. However, the site does sit as a feature within the open agricultural landscape with woodlands and Brooke Conservation Area beyond.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside, the existing Development Boundary is approx.130m to the south of the site.

### **Availability**

The site is in a single ownership and is available. Viability has not been proven, no evidence of viability has been submitted and there is no developer involved.

### **Achievability**

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: May 2022