



# Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

## Site Assessments

### Forncett St Mary and Forncett St Peter

## Contents

SN0429SL .....	3
SN0559 .....	10
SN1002 .....	17
SN1039 .....	24
SN1040 .....	31
SN2028 .....	39
SN2058 .....	46
SN5027 .....	55

SN0429SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0429SL
Site address	Land at Spicers Lane, Forncett St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.30ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	SL extension (due to size)  9 dwellings put forward under GNLP
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified.
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Via Spicers Lane to the west No footpath along Spicers Lane Promoter has advised that the requisite visibility splays can be achieved within land in the client's ownership.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS-Amber</b> Access could be achieved but would require local widening, footway provision and removal of frontage trees.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Fornsett St Peter Church of England Primary school – 1700 meters from site</p> <p>Variety of small-scale local employment in the vicinity.</p> <p>Long Stratton services/facilities – 4800 meters from site</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village hall/playing field – 450 meters from site  The Norfolk Tank Museum – 1800 meters from site	
Utilities Capacity	Green	No specific know constraints, but Anglian Water response needed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Unknown/to be confirmed	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Greenfield site with no known issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1 Some areas very low risk of surface water flooding	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  ALC: Grade 3 No loss of high grade agricultural land.	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	No designated landscapes  Contained site, with mature trees and hedging to the north and east.	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Four sets of semi-detached houses to the north.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No designated sites within close proximity. However, some mature hedgerow/tress on the boundary, which are likely to require assessment.	
Historic Environment	Amber	2 Grade II LB within 200 meters of site  <b>HES</b> – Amber	
Open Space	Green	Development of the site will not result in the loss of designated open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	Local highway network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b> The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Residential to the north Agricultural to the west	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

After the initial desktop assessment was undertaken it was concluded that the site was unsuitable for development and therefore a site visit was not required and that a site visit would not change the opinion of the officer.

#### 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		
Area of Special Advertisement Control		
RAF Old Buckenham safeguard Zone		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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



## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size for a SL extension. This site is located off Spicers Lane with limited accessibility to services, other than a bus stop and school. It is remote from the main part of the settlement and the road network is limited. There are concerns relating to trees and hedgerow loss. A small area of flood risk has been identified on the site although it is considered that with appropriate design this could be avoided.

### **Site Visit Observations**

After the initial desktop assessment was undertaken it was concluded that the site was unsuitable for development and therefore a site visit was not required and that a site visit would not change the opinion of the officer.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within open countryside.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is **UNREASONABLE** for development. The site is separated from the main part of the settlement and the existing settlement boundary for Forncett St Mary. The surrounding and immediate highway network is substandard with no safe walking route to the school. Whilst it is adjacent to existing residential development along Spicers Lane, further development would impact on an otherwise rural area where the character is limited of development. The site is also within close proximity to Grade II Listed Buildings to the south which could cause heritage impacts, however it is considered that these impacts could be mitigated.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 11 February 2021

SN0559

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0559
Site address	Four Seasons Nursery, Cheney's Lane, Forncett St. Mary, NR16 1JT
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation - Residential development of more than of 12 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	At 25dph the site could accommodate 23 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	Red	<b>NCC HIGHWAYS - Amber</b> Satisfactory access would require frontage widening & footway, along with removal of substantial portion of frontage hedge/trees to enable provision of acceptable visibility. Local highway network not suitable for development traffic, no safe walking route to catchment school & local facilities.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Primary school – 1900 meters from site	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall – 650 meters from site	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green	To be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		A Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues. Previous use – nursery.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1 Very low chance of surface water flooding	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  ALC: Grade 2	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would not relate to existing settlement in landscape.	Amber
Townscape	Red	Located within rural area	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	Four Seasons is a Grade II LB <b>HES</b> – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of designated open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	Local road network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b> The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

After the initial desktop assessment was undertaken it was concluded that the site was unsuitable for development and therefore a site visit was not required and that a site visit would not change the opinion of the officer.

#### 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)
Listed Building	Four Seasons – Grade II	
Open Countryside		
Area of Special Advertisement Control		
RAF Old Buckenham Safeguard Zone		
Conclusion	Private ownership with multiple owners	Green
	Owner is developer	

## 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 ownership with multiple owners	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Owner is developer	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highways improvements are likely to be required.	
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Information not available	
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Promoted a self- build	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation and is adjacent to existing development. Development of this site would constitute backland development and would break out into the rural surroundings. Highways and heritage constraints have been identified .

### Site Visit Observations

After the initial desktop assessment was undertaken it was concluded that the site was unsuitable for development and therefore a site visit was not required and that a site visit would not change the opinion of the officer.

### Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and remote from development boundary. No conflicting LP designations.

### Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

### Achievability

No further constraints identified.

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. Development of the site would constitute backland development and would have an adverse impact on the form and character of the current very rural area. Since the initial GNLP submission, a point of access has been identified to the east via Spicers Lane, where highway evidence has highlighted concerns of the possibility of creating a suitable access to the site. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable in terms of road capacity or lack of footpath provision, where there is limited accessibility to services, other than a bus stop and School. Development of the site would result in the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land which is identified as *Very Good Quality Agricultural Land* that has minor limitations which affect crop yield, cultivations or harvesting. In addition to this, the site is located near to the River Valley, Forncett Conservation Area and within the curtilage of the Four Seasons Grade II Listed Building.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: February 2021



## SN1002

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1002
Site address	Forngett
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	21.36ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified
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	Red	<b>NCC Highways – Red</b> Visibility at Long Stratton Rd appears to be limited by road layout and adjacent tree line. Access could be formed at Northfield Rd with tree removals and widening but the road is highly unsuitable for development traffic, it is narrow with a poor horizontal alignment/restricted forward visibility.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	Forncett Primary School – approx. 2700 m  Forncett End is located to the east where there are several services	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Forncett Village Hall approx. 1300m  Forncett End is located to the east where there are several services: The Jolly Farmers - PH	
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advised that all main key services, other than gas are readily available.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1 across all 3 sites. The most northern and southern site has areas of low risk- medium risk of surface flood.	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> )		ALC: Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Landscape issues  No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Development would have a poor relationship to the existing settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	There is a group of Grade II LB's where Northfield Rd meets Long Stratton Road (to the east).  <b>NCC HES- Amber</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	Local road network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b> There is no safe walking route to the catchment school, or local facilities. The site is remote and unsustainable  <b>Highways meeting -</b> Poor highway network with limited footpaths. Sites put forward are generally remote development.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and farm buildings	Red

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

After the initial desktop assessment was undertaken it was concluded that the site was unsuitable for development and therefore a site visit was not required and that a site visit would not change the opinion of the officer.

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership One tenant lease' all the land. Only the statutory notice period to the tenant is required for acquisition. There are no restrictive covenants.	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. Time for present tenant's notice (harvest of current standing crops).	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	NCC to provide comments.	
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is excessive in scale and development in its entirety or at the scale promoted would not be compatible with the existing pattern of development in the settlement. However, the site could be reduced in area to accommodate a lower number of dwellings. The sites appear remote in terms of accessibility to services and facilities where there is a poor highway network with limited footpaths.

### **Site Visit Observations**

After the initial desktop assessment was undertaken it was concluded that the site was unsuitable for development and therefore a site visit was not required and that a site visit would not change the opinion of the officer.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting LP designations. Outside development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available following termination of lease.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** due to the poor relationship with the existing village/built up areas (Forncett St Mary/Peter and Forncett End), where development could adversely affect the natural rural landscape setting. The sites provide an important gap between development in Forncett End to the east and Forncett St Mary to the west. Where whilst there is sporadic development surrounding the parcels of land identified, these are minimal groupings of 1 or 2 houses. Highways have raised concerns with the poor highway network surrounding the sites that have limited footpaths. A development of reduced scale would not sufficiently address these concerns.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: February 2020

## SN1039

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1039
Site address	Kilamay Farm, Wash Lane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.4
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	SL Extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified
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	Red	Access via Wash Lane  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber</b> Access subject to carrigeway widening, frontage footway and provision of adequate visibility, would require removal of frontage hedge.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Primary School 600 m from site  Located opposite mechanics  Bus stop – 660 meters. Limited daily services – 1 (Konectbus) which runs to Diss and Norwich.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village hall and playing field – 1700m from site	
Utilities Capacity	Green	Local wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises that site has access to main waters supply and electricity, query over main sewage and gas.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1 Low surface flood to the south along Wash Lane.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Rural River Valley	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		A1: Tas Rural River Valley ALC: Garde 3	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would not relate well to existing settlement in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Green		Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	The site is also in close proximity to SSSI	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Forncett St Peter War Memorial (Grade II), St Peters Rectory LB (Grade II) and Church of St Peter LB (Grade I) all within 500m 2 other Grade II within 400m  <b>HES - Amber</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	Constrained local highway  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS - Red</b> Adjacent highway network not of an adequate standard to support development traffic. No safe walking route to catchment school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural, residential and commercial (mechanics yard)	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

After the initial desktop assessment was undertaken it was concluded that the site was unsuitable for development and therefore a site visit was not required and that a site visit would not change the opinion of the officer.

#### 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		
River Valley		
Areas of Special Advertisement Control		
RAF Old Buckenham Safeguard Zone		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Located within River Valley	Amber

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No viability or development appraisal has been undertaken at the time of submission. However, promoter has advised that there is nothing to suggest that the site would not be deliverable within a relatively short timescale or would not be viable.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highways improvements are likely to be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site potentially suitable size for a settlement limit extension, although the existing settlement limit in this location is to the north and not immediately adjacent to the site. Surface flood risk have been identified, site is within close proximity to LBs and is considered remote from services. Constrained highway.

### **Site Visit Observations**

After the initial desktop assessment was undertaken it was concluded that the site was unsuitable for development and therefore a site visit was not required and that a site visit would not change the opinion of the officer.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for a settlement limit extension. The site is largely detached from the existing settlement where there are limited services and facilities. The site is located to the south of a group of Listed Buildings, including the Grade I St Peter Church and associated. The views between these heritage assets and the site are largely uninterrupted where developed could impact on their setting. The site is also within the Tas Rural River Valley which also provides an attractive rural setting, any landscape impact would need to be mitigated. Highway constraints have also been identified; access is via a narrow rural carriageway. The site is located opposite a commercial use (currently used as a mechanic yard) where there are potential concerns regarding amenity issues.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: February 2020

## SN1040

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1040
Site address	Land at mill Road / Overwood Lane / Gilderswood
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.2ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Red	<p>Access via Mill Lane Footpath located to the northern part of Mill Road, to the front of the exiting dwellings.</p> <p>There is currently no formal access onto the land. New access would therefore need to be formed onto Mill Road, Overwood Lane and Gilderswood. Good visibility is available along the site frontages in all directions.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber</b> Access subject to carrigeway widening, frontage footway and provision of adequate visibility.</p>	Amber



Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Primary School 500 meters from site</p> <p>Nearest bus stop – 500m Bus service 1 (Konect): runs to Diss to Norwich 4/5 times 6 days a week.</p> <p>Long Stratton Medical Partnership – 3000m</p> <p>Florist and hair studio (Forncett End) - 2700</p>	Amber
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Forncett Village Hall approx. 1700m</p> <p>The Jolly Farmers PH (Forncett End) – 2500m</p> <p>3 holiday cottage/lets within 1000 meters</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed. AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advised that all main key services, other than gas and main sewage are readily available.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1	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  ALC: Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have poor relationship with existing settlement in landscape when approaching the settlement from the east along Wash Lane. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Disconnected from other parts of settlement but linear development would be similar to existing pattern of development in evidence.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Alborough Farm – Grade II LB – 300m St Peters Church – Grade I LB and associated buildings Grade II – 500 m  Multiple Grade II Lb located along Aslacton Road to the north.  Immediately north of the site is the site of a medieval windmill, as recorded in 1568 (29839 Type of record: Monument)  <b>HES - Amber</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Red	<p>Local road network is constrained</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b></p> <p>Adjacent highway network not of an adequate standard to support development traffic. Constrained visibility at Pottergate St junction with Muir La. No safe walking route to catchment school.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

After the initial desktop assessment was undertaken it was concluded that the site was unsuitable for development and therefore a site visit was not required and that a site visit would not change the opinion of the officer.

#### 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)
Site of Archaeological Interest		
Open Countryside		
Area of Special Advertisement Control		
RAF Old Buckenham Safeguard Zone		
<b>Conclusion</b>		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?	Sole and private 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?	Immediately. Landowner lives at Killarney Farm, Wash Lane.	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	NCC to provide comments.	
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Information not available to me	
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated however it has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings (10 -15 dwellings). The site is remote from the existing settlement limits. The site is detached from the main areas of the settlement and would extend further into the landscape to the south of Mill Lane. There are some identified areas of surface water flooding within the site. There is not existing access onto the site, whilst this is considered achievable, it would be subject to sufficient carriageway widening, frontage footway and provision of adequate visibility. Heritage and landscape constraints have also been identified.

### **Site Visit Observations**

After the initial desktop assessment was undertaken it was concluded that the site was unsuitable for development and therefore a site visit was not required and that a site visit would not change the opinion of the officer.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised that the site is available.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development due to heritage and landscape impacts. Whilst the site is part of a smaller group of dwellings along Mill Road, the site is detached from the main areas of the settlement and is not adjacent to any existing settlement boundaries. The site is rural in character with site frontage hedges that provide the setting to the monument asset identified, where development in this location would impact upon the heritage setting. Development of this site would result in encroachment into the countryside, beyond the existing boundaries of the settlement and would have a landscape impact as a result.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: February 2020

## SN2028

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2028
Site address	Low Road, Forncett St Mary NR16 1JJ
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.51ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Between the site and the Church there is a public footpath which provides access to the Tas Valley  <b>HIGHWAYS – Amber</b> Sufficient frontage available to form acceptable access, would require local road improvements to include carriageway realignment/widening and provision of frontage footway, along with removal of frontage hedge. No safe walking route to school, or local facilities. Local highway network not of a sufficient standard to accommodate development traffic. Location remote/unsustainable.	Amber



Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Primary school – 1400 meters from site	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village Hall – located opposite site	
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Improvements may be required to the waste water recycling centre	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable		Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment		A1: Tas Rural River Valley	
Townscape	Green	Public right of way along the southern boundary	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development would not relate to existing settlement in landscape.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Existing hedgerow along Low Road. No protected sites in close proximity	Amber
Open Space	Amber	With close proximity to the Grade 1 listed Forngett St Mary Church Adjacent to CA	Amber
Transport and Roads	Green	Development of the site will not result in the loss of designated open space	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	<b>HIGHWAYS -Red</b> No safe walking route to school, or local facilities. Local highway network not of a sufficient standard to accommodate development traffic. Location remote/unsustainable.	Red
	Green	Village Hall and agricultural	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

After the initial desktop assessment was undertaken it was concluded that the site was unsuitable for development and therefore a site visit was not required and that a site visit would not change the opinion of the officer.

#### 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)
Site of Archaeological Interest		
Open Countryside		
River Valley		
Area of Special Advertisement Control		
RAF Old Buckenham Safeguard Zone		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Located within River Valley	

## 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 and sole owner	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Site is owned by a developer/promoter	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size for allocation. Heritage, highways, townscape and landscape concerns have been identified. Areas of the site are also affected by surface water flood risk.

### **Site Visit Observations**

After the initial desktop assessment was undertaken it was concluded that the site was unsuitable for development and therefore a site visit was not required and that a site visit would not change the opinion of the officer.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

No conflicting LP designations.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** due to access and highways issues, the impact upon the historic character and the detrimental townscape impact the development would have. Whilst the site is in close proximity to the school and the existing development boundary, it has a poor relationship with existing residential development, both in terms of form and connectivity. Areas of the site are also affected by surface water flood risk. Off-site highway works would also be required.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: February 2021

SN2058

Part 1 - Site Details

<b>Detail</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	SN2058
<b>Site address</b>	Tawny Farm, Station Road, Forncett St Peter
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	2003/2316 – Demolition of outbuilding and erection of 1 dwelling - Refused 2004/1188 – Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of 2 storey dwelling – Dismissed on appeal 2007/0404 – Conversion of building to annexe – Approved 2011/1797 – C/u of three existing buildings from commercial to holiday lets – approved 2012/0619 – Detached House – dismissed on appeal 2013/0916 – Detached house - approved 2015/1999 – C/u of outbuilding to ancillary use for existing holiday units - approved 2018/1944 – Erection of 3 dwellings – dismissed on appeal
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.96
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension</b>	Allocation of 15 dwellings (self-bulild)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	Unspecified
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	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**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access via Station Road  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS - Red</b> Substantial highway works and land dedication would be required to form a safe access, combined with an appropriate treatment of Station Road junction with Wacton Road.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Primary School – 1600m  Long Stratton medical practice – 3200m  Bus stop located adjacent site along Station Road. Bus service 1 (Konect): runs to Diss to Norwich 4/5 times 6 days a week.	



Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Forncett Village Hall approx. 1700m	
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Improvements may be required to the waste water recycling centre	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises main water and electricity available to site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1 Ponds to the south eastern corner.  <b>F&amp;W-</b> Few or no Constraints. No areas of surface water risk identified on this site as shown in the Environment Agency's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. Watercourse not apparent. AW foul sewer present in Bunwell Street to the southeast of the site. Located in Source Protection Zone 3	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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B1: Tas Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	1 Grade II LB located to the east of Station Road 3 other Grade II LB within 500m Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB located to the south but could be reasonably mitigated.  <b>HES - Amber</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b> Local highway network unsuitable for development traffic - constrained by horizontal alignment limiting forward visibility and adjacent brick arch rail bridge with limited clearance. No safe walking route to catchment school, site remote and considered unsustainable.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential  Note: The buildings on site comprise two units of holiday accommodation and a communal games room.	Green



#### Part 4 - Site Visit

After the initial desktop assessment was undertaken it was concluded that the site was unsuitable for development and therefore a site visit was not required and that a site visit would not change the opinion of the officer.

#### 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		
Areas of Special Advertisement Control		
RAF Old Buckenham Safeguard Zone		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Sole and private	
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No but several enquires received over the past 3 years (inc Saffron Housing)	
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Form from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Likely off-site highway improvements. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Form from promoter advising same	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Option of self-build	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation; however, it is only promoted for up to 15 dwellings. Whilst the site is located to the west of a small group of housing off Station Road, the site is at the limits of accessibility to services in terms of distance, a problem which is exacerbated by the lack of footways. Tawny Farm is approximately 925m outside of the development boundary. Highway constraints have also been identified. It is also noted the development of the site would require demolition of existing holiday accommodation.

### Site Visit Observations

After the initial desktop assessment was undertaken it was concluded that the site was unsuitable for development and therefore a site visit was not required and that a site visit would not change the opinion of the officer.

### Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside adjacent to development boundary.

### Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

### Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. Highway safety concerns have been identified in that the site lies on the north side of Station Road, on the inside of an "S" bend, with the existing access being located approximately 45m to the east of the railway bridge. This part of Station Road is largely a national speed limit road of a relatively narrow width and few opportunities for pedestrians and cyclists to seek refuge on the road verge. The Highways Authority have suggested that substantial highway works, and land dedication would be required to form a safe access, combined with an appropriate treatment of Station Road junction with Wacton Road. It is also noted that the existing buildings on site comprise two units of holiday accommodation where it has not been demonstrated that the holiday accommodation is not economically viable as holiday accommodation. This would need further investigation. The site is in the setting of 3 listed buildings, meaning that development to the south end of the site would have an impact on the setting of these designated heritage assets, however development could be reasonably mitigated.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: February 2021

## SN5027

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5027
Site address	Land north of Station Road, Forncett St Peter
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Various householder applications for Station bungalow.  Site to south: 2011/0016 Removal of Oil Depot and redevelopment for 17 dwellings Outline approved. 2014/0290 Reserved matters approved.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Up to 1.80ha with 0.67ha for residential and remaining as public open space/woodland
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	45 dwellings at 25dph on 1.80ha 17 dwellings at 25dph on 0.67ha
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>There is an existing access to service the site. Promoter has suggested that, should it be necessary, a new access point can be created further eastwards along Station Road. This could improve visibility given the access as existing is in relatively close proximity of a bend in the highway.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Unlikely to be able to achieve satisfactory visibility due to road alignment. Network poor alignment adj to site, forward vis concern, no footway to catchment primary school.</p>	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <b>Part 1:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Primary School; 1,700m</p> <p>Long Stratton;-            Manor Field Infants; 2,700m            High School; 2,600m            Medical practice; 2,200m</p> <p>Bus stop located 50m along Station Road. Bus service 1 (Konect): runs to Diss to Norwich 4/5 times 6 days a week.</p>	N/A



Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Forngett Village Hall; 1,600m Long Stratton Leisure Centre; 2,300m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Red	Promoter states that there is no evidence to suggest that utilities capacity will be a constraint.  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Amber. Mains Foul drainage goes to Forngett St Peter WRC - this serves 93 people and we do not have any measured flow information for it. Permitted Dry Weather Flow (DWF) data is recorded as 31.3 m3/day. This equates to around 90 houses in total, so this WRC would likely have limited capacity as already serves 93 people. Further consideration would need undertaking in liaison with AWS.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter indicates that provision will need to be made for utilities infrastructure and given the predominantly greenfield nature of the site, such utilities are readily available and given the proximity of existing development that includes the recent Hunts Mead residential development opposite.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No known ground stability issues. Variety of existing uses – may need investigation.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Red	<p>Flood Zone 1 Surface Water Flood Risk 1:30 High Risk running straight through the open, developable part of the site.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b>– Amber. Surface water flood risk, would not prevent development but would need significant mitigation. The site is affected by minor flowpath in the 3.33% AEP event and minor/moderate flow path in the 0.1% AEP event. The flow path cuts the site southeast-west. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows west off of the site. This needs to be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>A large area of the site is unaffected by flood risk and has the potential to be developed.</p> <p>Any water leading from off-site to on-site should be considered as part of any drainage strategy for the site.</p> <p>EA mapping indicates high water depth in the flow path.</p> <p>Access to the site may be affected by the on-site and off-site flood risk.</p>	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	<p>Tributary Farmland</p> <p>Rural River Valley adjacent to north-west along railway line.</p>	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	<p>B1 – Tas Tributary Farmland</p> <p>A1-Tas Rural River Valley adjacent to north-west along railway line.</p> <p>Agricultural Land classification: Non-agricultural use</p>	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The developable areas of the site are contained and would have very little impact on the wider landscape providing the wood and trees are retained.	Green
Townscape	Green	The developable area is contained and there are dwellings to the south where Hunts Mead has created a cul-de-sac. However this site would extend to the north of Forncett Road and would add to development in a location that is completely separated from the main part of any settlement.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>The paddock area has relatively low habitat value being solely grass but it does form a link between the wooded area and hedge lines surrounding. Would require investigation.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Green. Avoid development in woodland (not identified as priority habitats). SSSI IRZ - allocation of 43 houses falls below threshold for consultation for residential/ rural residential.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Forncett St Peter WRC discharges to the Tas, a tributary of the River Yare. This river is likely to be in the Nutrient Neutrality area, where off-setting of development is required for development to protect the European sites of Yare Broads &amp; Marshes.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No nearby heritage assets affected, closest is approx.150m away.</p> <p>The railway line is a Site of Archaeological Interest.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>There is a road link to Long Stratton and consequently through to the A140.</p> <p>Station Road has bus stops however pedestrian access in either direction is dangerous, no footpath and unlit. No safe route to school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Unlikely to be able to achieve satisfactory visibility due to road alignment. Network poor alignment adj to site, forward vis concern, no footway to catchment primary school.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Residential and agricultural.</p> <p>Railway line along entire north-west boundary.</p>	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact on historic environment. It is acknowledged that there has been relatively recent development opposite at Hunts Mead but this was a brownfield site and was considered an improvement on the previous oil depot. This site is different and, in townscape terms, it would represent a consolidation of development in this unsustainable location.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Two existing accesses, one to the bungalow and one further north-east to the area of grassed land.  Both on the outside of a severe bend and would require Highway Authority consult.  No paths or streetlights and access by foot to any facilities would be dangerous.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Part residential; Station Bungalow, part wooded, part open grassland (pastureland).	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential, woodland, railway. Would the railway restrict development in close proximity?	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level with a slight slope south-north and up from the road access.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Native hedge to frontage, tree belt to rear and wooded area to north-east.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant habitat with adjacent wooded area and hedges. Also pond in relatively close proximity to south, would need Ecologist advice.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	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)	Telephone line across part of frontage.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Minimal views from roadside but otherwise no long views as site is contained by woodland, railway and existing dwelling.	N/A
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	<p>Only part of the total site identified would be developable for residential, the wooded area would have to remain, as would the tree belt along the railway.</p> <p>However, although there are facilities in Long Stratton and Fornsett St Peter, these are not accessible by foot given the lack of footpath and dangerous road conditions. This would be development in an unsustainable location.</p>	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Promoter states that the site is viable, no evidence submitted.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Possible open space, access improvements.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter indicated that it would be provided, no evidence to support viability.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Would be willing to make the wooded area to the north/east of the site accessible to the public on allocation.	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size for allocation. The Highways Authority and LLFA have identified issues with the development of the site. In addition, the Environmental Agency has also flagged issues with Forncett St Peter WRC discharging into the Tas, a tributary of the River Yare.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Only part of the site identified would be developable for residential, the wooded area would have to remain, as would the tree belt along the railway. However, although there are facilities in Long Stratton and Forncett St Peter, these are not accessible by foot given the lack of footpath and dangerous road conditions. This would be development in an unsustainable location.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside development boundary. Located within Tributary Farmland, Rural River Valley adjacent to north-west along railway line.

### **Availability**

The site is promoted by an Agent on behalf of the Landowner and appears available based on the information provided

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered an UNREASONABLE option for development. The site is heavily constrained by highways; the site is unable to achieve satisfactory visibility due to the existing road alignment. In addition, the surrounding road network is poor where the adjacent road alignment to site would result in forward visibility concerns which is exacerbated by no footway to catchment primary school. With regards to surface water flood risk, the LLFA have also highlighted that whilst the known flood issues would not prevent development, they would need significant mitigation. It has also been noted that the access to the site may be affected by the on-site and off-site flood risk.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022