



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Site Assessments

Hales, Heckingham, Langley with Hardley,
Carlton St Peter, Claxton, Raveningham
and Sisland

Contents

SN0530	3
SN5046SL	13

SN0530

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0530
Site address	Land west of Claxton Church Road, Claxton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.79ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approximately 8 dwellings – however assuming 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No, but within 3km of Broads (SAC, SPA, National Park, SSSI) and recorded protected species on site (Brown Hare).
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	There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. NCC Highways – Red, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Bus stop within 2.08km bus route 85</p> <p>Bus stop on the A146 1.85km</p> <p>Primary school 1.72km</p> <p>Employment opportunities within 2km</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Claxton Village Hall 1.78km</p> <p>Thurlton Village hall/recreational ground and pre-school 1.67km</p> <p>Thurlton George and Dragon PH and takeaway 1.86km</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site. No mains sewer	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

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.</p> <p>SNC Environmental Services Land Quality, Green:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No potentially contaminated sites shown within 500m of the site in question on the Landmark database. ○ A potentially contaminated site is shown about 380m to northeast of the site in question on PCLR database which is identified as a pit that was shown on Historic OS maps from 1881 to 1891 after which it was not shown to be present. ○ Historic OS maps do not show any additional information. ○ As the filled site is over 100 years old it is not considered significant. <p>Having regard to the size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Surface water flooding 1:100 and 1:000 to the north west part of the site boundary	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>)		B3 - Rockland Tributary Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	<p>The site is located in a distinctly rural part of the District. Open flat landscape with small groups of dwellings and farms complexes characterises the area.</p> <p>The site is detached from the main part of the village. Not adjacent to a development boundary.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could not be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site</p>	Red/Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Development may impact on protected species, which may not be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Within 3km of Broads(SAC, SPA, National Park, SSSI) and recorded protected species on site (Brown Hare).</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Development could have detrimental impact on LB's. St Andrews's Church Grade 1 listed building is located to the north.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, and 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.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	<p>Agricultural and residential</p> <p>SNC Environmental Services Amenity, Green: - No issues observed.</p>	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB's. The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could not be reasonably mitigated.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, and 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.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow to front boundary north and south open to the west	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow to front boundary. Proximity to the Boards noted.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	no	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Low hedgerow and flat landscape the site is clearly visible from the road and across the open countryside in long views. Public footpath located the west beyond the site running north – south. From which the site will be clearly visible.	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	<p>The site is located in a distinctly rural part of the District. Open flat landscape with small groups of dwellings and farms complexes characterises the area.</p> <p>The site is located beyond an existing cluster of development and farm buildings to the south in Ashby St Mary with Claxton House opposite.</p> <p>Development would harm the open landscape separating Ashby from Claxton and Hellington .</p> <p>The site is detached from the main part of the village. Not adjacent to a development boundary. It is not well related to services.</p> <p>Development could have detrimental impact on LB's. St Andrews's Church Grade 1 listed building is located to the north via views across the open landscape.</p> <p>There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.</p>	Amber/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		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter 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?	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable, due to potential adverse impacts on Heritage assets, Landscape, biodiversity and highway safety. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. The site is detached from the main part of the village, not adjacent to a development boundary and is not well related to services. Development could have detrimental impact on LB's including St Andrews's Church Grade 1 listed building, located to the north, with views across the open landscape.

Site Visit Observations

The site is located in a distinctly rural part of the District. Open flat landscape with small groups of dwellings and farms complexes characterises the area. The site is located beyond an existing cluster of development and farm buildings to the south in Ashby St Mary with Claxton House opposite. Development would harm the open landscape separating Ashby from Claxton and Hellington.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Unreasonable – The site is poorly located for access to services either within this Village Cluster, or within the adjoining cluster of Thurton and Ashby St Mary (some of which are closer) and Highways do not consider a suitable access can be achieved to the site from Church Lane. The site is very rural with consequent detrimental impacts on the relatively open landscape (visible from highways and footpaths) and development would effectively be a isolated group of dwellings in the countryside. There are also heritage assets in the vicinity, including the Grade 1 Listed St Andrew's Church, and protected species (brown hare) have been noted on site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 26/01/2021

SN5046SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5046SL
Site address	Land east of The Cottage, St John's Lane, Sisland
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2019/1652/F for replacement dwelling refused 31/10/2019, appeal dismissed 24/02/2021. 2017/1874/F for replacement dwelling refused 09/10/2017.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.19
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	1-2 dwellings 5 at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access is via an unmade track off Church Farm Road. There is an existing access, but it would need to be improved. NCC Highways – Red. Insufficient information to comment. Suspect remote with poor network.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Loddon is to the east with services approximate distances; 1,900m Junior school 2,000m Medical Centre 2,200m High School 2,300m Infant and nursery However, the majority of these are over the distances considered to be walkable, in addition the lack of footpaths, unlit narrow roads make it dangerous for pedestrians. Therefore, the vast majority of journeys would be using a vehicle.	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	2,150m Playing fields 2,300m Community hall	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known capacity issues. Environment Agency: Green	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains electric and potable water connections exist.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Under Consideration for further upgrades.	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Original use residential but derelict now. Environmental Quality did not have any significant concerns when consulted on recent application. NCC Minerals & Waste - site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that - future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Red	<p>Flood Zone Surface water flooding; High and medium risk running diagonally through the centre of the site.</p> <p>LLFA – Amber. Would not prevent development but significant mitigation required. The site is affected by minor ponding in the 3.33% AEP event, a minor/ moderate flow path in the 1.0% AEP event and moderate/major flow path in the 0.1% AEP event. The flow path cuts the site southeast-west. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows east off of the site. This needs to be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>A large area of the site is affected by flood risk. This needs to be considered in the site assessment.</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>Access to the site may be affected by the on-site and off-site flood risk.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</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	B5 - Chet Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification: non-agricultural land	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	This previously developed plot is now uninhabited, and the very modest traditional cottage is derelict. More than doubling the amount of development and moving it up the slope, as would be required to avoid the surface water flood risk, would increase its prominence and impact on the landscape in this remote location.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The site is separate from any built-up area and is in the countryside which is characterised by farm-houses and small groups of houses. However, it would reflect the location of the other properties which are to the north of this track.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Two ponds within 500m, derelict buildings, mature trees and hedges. An ecology report was submitted with the application – no significant effects noted, bat survey and mitigation would be required. NCC Ecologist: Green. Off PROW Sisland FP2 (consult PROW Officer). SSSI IRZ but residential not identified requiring NE consultation. Discharge of water >20m ³ /day to seep away or surface water requires NE consultation. Not in GI corridor. Environment Agency: Green	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets affected. HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	Along unmade track from Church Farm Road which is a single-track lane that connects to Mundham Road/Loddon Road. Sisland Footpath 2 runs along the track. No footpaths or street-lights in the vicinity. NCC Highways – Red. Insufficient information to comment. Suspect remote with poor network.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	None	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	There is an access which would need to be improved and would require the removal of some of the hedge.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	There is a derelict cottage on site which has not been occupied for 60 years. Whether or not there is a lawful residential use has been under debate in the recent Appeal. The Appeal for a replacement dwelling was dismissed.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agriculture – compatible uses.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	On a slope, with higher ground to north (rear).	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature trees and established hedges.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Two small ponds in vicinity. Vegetation as above.	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)	None evident.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Because the site is off the adopted highway the views are limited.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>The site is remote from any settlement and the only access is along an unadopted, unlit track and road with no street-lights.</p> <p>Whilst there was once a small dwelling here it is derelict and has not been lived in for around 60 years. A modern dwelling would alter the site significantly, have a far greater impact on the landscape and encroach into the countryside. There is also an issue with surface water flooding.</p>	<p>Red</p>

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	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?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Promoted as an extension to the Settlement Limit however there is no Settlement Limit for Sisland and there are no plans to designate one. The site contains a small dwelling, now derelict. Applications for replacement dwellings have previously been refused, the most recent having been dismissed at appeal in 2021. The proposal is for two dwellings which would need to be located to a more visually prominent part of the site to avoid flood risk. The site is at the limits of distances to services and the issue is compounded by the route being a mix of narrow, unlit country lanes and the more heavily trafficked Mundham Road, all of which have no footways and are subject to the national speed limit; furthermore, the main local services are in Loddon, which requires crossing the A146 at a busy roundabout junction. The access track to the site is part of the PRow network.

Site Visit Observations

The site is remote from any settlement and the only access is along an unadopted, unlit track and road with no street-lights.

Whilst there was once a small dwelling here it is derelict and has not been lived in for around 60 years. A modern dwelling would alter the site significantly, have a far greater impact on the landscape and encroach into the countryside. There is also an issue with surface water flooding.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

No additional supporting evidence submitted.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE site for either a SL Extension or for allocation as it is an unsustainable location. The site relates poorly to the existing services which are all over 2km away. These are more than the distances considered to be readily walkable and, in this case, the lack of any footpaths on the rural, unlit narrow roads makes it dangerous for pedestrians. It would encroach into the countryside and have some impact on the landscape. In addition, improving the access (which is a PRow) would necessitate the removal of part of a hedgerow. Surface water flooding would require mitigation.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 29/04/2022