



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Site Assessments

Hempnall, Topcroft St, Morningthorpe,
Fritton, Shelton and Hardwick

Contents

SN0147	3
SN0178SL	11
SN0580	19
SN1015	27
SN1016	35
SN1017	43
SN1018	52
SN2029SL	60
SN2046	68
SN2081	76
SN2146	84
SN4012	92
SN4083	100
SN5012SL	108
SN5056SL	117

SN0147

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0147
Site address	Land around Alburgh Road and Silver Green, Sycamore Farm, 17 Alburgh Road, Hempnall Green
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Permissions associated with farm use
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	13.17 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Mixed use to include business/industrial and community – residential densities unspecified (25 dph = 342 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Part - 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	Main access from Alburgh Road and field access from Silver Green. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development NCC HIGHWAYS - Red Not feasible to construct a satisfactory access. 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 safe walking route to the catchment school	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>2.1 km walk to primary school</p> <p>Local retail and limited employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Bus service including peak (bus stop nearby)</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 		Village hall (with groups) and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, electricity and mains sewer to site. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Site is potentially contaminated due to previous use. Investigation required.	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified in eastern and northern sections and along highway boundary.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact which may be mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of the site at the scale promoted would have a detrimental impact which could not be mitigated. Impacts would be limited through a reduction in site area	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Ponds close to western and eastern boundaries. Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of heritage assets. Impact may be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development at scale promoted likely to harm setting of LBs to north, west and south. Harm could be limited by reduction in site area, design and boundary treatment.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing wide access serves site. Scope for further improvements. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to west and agriculture to other boundaries	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 (including trees) to most boundaries, more open to NE section	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant hedgerow along highway boundary. Ponds close to western and eastern boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views from north east and from Silver Green to south.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Development at scale promoted would have adverse impact on form, character and landscape, heritage assets and existing residential amenity. NCC to comment on impact on local highway network.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open countryside		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is not considered suitable for allocation due to its scale at which it is promoted. Even with a reduction in size there are constraints relating townscape, landscape, connectivity and heritage considerations. Highways have also raised concerns over the feasibility of creating a satisfactory access.

Site Visit Observations

Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Development at scale promoted would have adverse impact on form, character and landscape, heritage assets and existing residential amenity.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

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

Achievability

No constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** site for allocation. The site is considered to be remote from services and facilities where highway safety concerns have also been identified. Access is via field access from Silver Green where it is considered not feasible to construct a satisfactory access and there is no safe walking route to the catchment school. Heritage and landscape constraints have also been identified.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 15 September 2020

SN0178SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0178SL
Site address	Land adjacent Tween Oaks, Alburgh Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.4 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	4 dwellings = 10 dph (25 dph= 10 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Field access from Alburgh Road. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development NCC HIGHWAYS-Amber A satisfactory access may be feasible but would require removal of frontage hedge/trees and provision of a 2.0m wide footway.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	2 km walk to primary school Local retail and limited employment opportunities within 1800m Bus service including peak	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Village hall (with groups) and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Area of identified flood risk along southern 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>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact which may be mitigated.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Drain along part of eastern boundary. Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of heritage assets which could be reasonably mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	NCC HIGHWAYS- Red 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 safe walking route to the catchment school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Any impacts of development at scale promoted on heritage assets to south likely to be mitigated through design and landscaping.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Field access only. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable. Would require removal of significant hedgerow	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north, south and east. Agricultural to west.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open to larger parcel of farmland to west. Other boundaries enclosed by hedgerow.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant hedgerow and trees along highway boundary. Drain in SE section of site.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Telegraph poles and O/H lines along eastern boundary	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views from west. Other boundaries enclosed by hedgerow. Prominent in views along road.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Some residential on western side of Alburgh Road and development at scale promoted could be mitigated by design and landscaping. However, would result in loss of significant hedgerow. to detrimental of character of lane. NCC to comment on impact on local highway network.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open countryside		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No supporting information submitted	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	A satisfactory access may be feasible but would require removal of frontage hedge/trees and provision of a 2.0m wide footway.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	N/A	
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be considered as a settlement limit extension however it would represent a significant breakout to the west of the Hempnall. Identified desktop constraints include highways, landscape impact and potential heritage issues.

Site Visit Observations

Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Some residential on western side of Alburgh Road and development at scale promoted could be mitigated by design and landscaping. However, would result in loss of significant hedgerow. to detrimental of character of lane.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations - open countryside.

Availability

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

Achievability

No constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** as an extension to the existing settlement limit of Hempnall. The site is remote from services where there is also no safe walking route to the catchment school. Whilst some residential development is located on the western side of Alburgh Road and development at scale promoted could be mitigated by design and landscaping, it has been noted that development would result in loss of significant hedgerow which would be detrimental of character of the lane. The site is open to larger parcels of farmland to the west where the site would be prominent in this direction.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 16 November 2020

SN0580

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0580
Site address	Land at Home Farm, Alburgh Road, Hempnall Green
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.94 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	11 – 23 dph (12-25 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Field access from Alburgh Road. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS- Amber</p> <p>A satisfactory access may be feasible but would require removal of frontage hedge/trees and provision of a 2.0m wide footway. 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 safe walking route to the catchment school.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>2.2 km walk to primary school</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Bus service including peak</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 		Pub within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No identified areas of flood risk within site	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact which may be mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development of the site may have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not have a detrimental impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets. NCC HEC - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Not likely to have any direct impacts on heritage assets.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural land abutting with residential nearby	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)	Site bounded by hedgerows	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site bounded by hedgerows with some significant trees although not along highway. Some loss of hedgerow likely for access improvements	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site visually contained but prominent in views from highway	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Development at scale promoted would have suburbanising effect outside settlement boundary. Could be reduced by limiting to frontage site only but connectivity issues remain. NCC to comment on impact on local highway network.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open countryside		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable for allocation at scale promoted due lack of connectivity and impacts on townscape and landscape. Highways issues also likely to constrain development at scale promoted.

Site Visit Observations

Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Development at scale promoted would have suburbanising effect outside settlement boundary. Could be reduced by limiting to frontage site only but connectivity issues remain. NCC to comment on impact on local highway network.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** as an allocated site due to unresolvable highway issues and impact on landscape and townscape. The site is considered to be remote from services where access to the site would require the removal of frontage hedge/trees and provision of a 2.0m wide footway as there is no safe walking route to the catchment school.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 16 November 2020

SN1015

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1015
Site address	Land adjacent to the primary school, The Street
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.6 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approx. 19 dwellings = 12 dph (25 dph = 40 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Existing access from The Street, Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS - May not be able to achieve acceptable visibility. 2,0m wide footway required at frontage along with carriageway widening to 5.5m minimum. Highway constrained in vicinity of site.</p> <p>Updated comments - would be preferable in highways terms (by a considerable margin), adjacent to the new vehicular access for the primary school.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	<p>Adjacent to primary school</p> <p>Doctor surgery, local retail and employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Peak bus service (on bus route)</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 		Community centre, recreation ground and village groups within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has not advised services to site. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified in western section and close to existing access	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design SNC Landscape officer: significant levels changes across the site which currently serves as the access to the primary school	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts on form and character of settlement. Impacts may be limited by reduced site area.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of Has to south and west and on character of CA. Impact may be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential/education/vacant land	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Views from the conservation area in this landscape gap of open countryside. Any development should be lower density to maintain some through views. Impact on character of CA and setting of HAs should be assessed	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access from The Street. Possibility of access to northern part of site from Old Market Way but check ownership - ransom strip? Already highway congestion along The Street. NCC to confirm feasibility	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture/unused/ 2 dwellings at northern end of site	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential development to west and south, education to east. Agriculture to north - compatible	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Ground level rises to north. There is embankment/earthwork within the site which creates an obstacle to development/road layout	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow/fencing. Open to north. PRow close to NE site boundary.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees within existing hedgerows	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Crossing northern part of site	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views from north and prominent in views from The Street	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)	Very accessible to local services and public transport. However, a complicated site with significant changes in ground level. Heritage and flood risk issues and congestion of existing highway network	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open countryside		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting statement from promoter addressing traffic, heritage and landscape	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	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?	Land for expansion of primary school	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considered a suitable size for allocation. It has been noted that there are potential issues with Heritage, highways and flood risk. Significant changes in levels could also constrain development.

Site Visit Observations

Very accessible to local services and public transport. However, a complicated site with significant changes in ground level. Heritage and flood risk issues and congestion of existing highway network.

Local Plan Designations

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a **REASONABLE** option for development. The site benefits from good connectivity and relates well to the existing built form of the settlement. The site is relatively open to the north with a PRow to the north east site boundary, where development should be lower density to maintain some through views and to reduce impact on the character of the Conservation Area and setting of the Listed Buildings. Off-site highway works have been identified however these are considered to be achievable. Development would also need to address change in levels across the site.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 21 August 2020

SN1016

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1016
Site address	Land at Busseys Loke
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.3 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 40 dwellings = 30 dph (25 dph = 32 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing access from Busseys Loke. NCC HIGHWAYS – Red Unlikely to be able to provide sufficient access visibility due to alignment of road. Bussey's Loke is narrow with restricted forward visibility and no footway, visibility from Bussey's Loke to The Street is sub-standard. Local highway network is not suitable for development traffic. No safe walking route to the catchment school.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	<p>300m walk to primary school</p> <p>Doctor surgery, local retail and employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Peak bus service</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 		Community centre, recreation ground and village groups within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has not advised services to site. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified at southern boundary and outside of eastern boundary.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be mitigated through design	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts on form and character of settlement may be mitigated through design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Red	Development likely to cause harm to designated assets that could not be reasonably mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber/Red
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	Development likely to have unacceptable impact on road network that could not be reasonably mitigated	Amber/Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Abuts eastern boundary of CA. Likely to harm setting of heritage assets to west and south and especially open setting of grade I listed church. Technical officer to confirm.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access from Busseys Loke, close to bend on narrow lane. The Street. NCC to confirm if access achievable given restricted width but also likely to require removal of significant amount of hedgerow in rural lane.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential development to south, agriculture to north and east, cemetery to west - compatible	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Established hedgerow with some significant trees/fencing.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees within existing hedgerows. Watercourse at southern end of site	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of contamination or utilities	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site enclosed by hedgerows but transected by PROWs	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Reasonably close to local services and public transport but lacking footpath provision. Development as promoted would harm rural landscape character as separated from settlement by church and cemetery. Would have significant impact on heritage, local highway network, PROWs and trees/hedgerows.	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	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promote but no supporting evidence submitted	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required. Would require diversion of PROWs	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 for allocation due to issues of heritage, highways, landscape, townscape and flood risk.

Site Visit Observations

Reasonably close to local services and public transport but lacking footpath provision. Development as promoted would harm rural landscape character as separated from settlement by church and cemetery. Would have significant impact on heritage, local highway network, PROWs and trees/hedgerows.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Would require diversion of PROWs.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** as an allocated site. The site would have a poor relationship with the existing form and character of the settlement. Whilst the site is reasonably close to local services and public transport, it is lacking footpath provision. Significant access and highway network constraints have been identified and are considered to be barriers to the delivery of this site. The site is also heavily constrained by 2 PROW's (PF7 and PF8) which would require diverting as they cross the middle of the site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 13 November 2020

SN1017

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1017
Site address	Land at Broaden Lane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic applications for residential development refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25 dwellings = 23 dph (25 dph = 25 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing access from Broaden Lane. NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber The appears site to have sufficient frontage to provide acceptable visibility but the existing frontage hedge would need to be removed, a 2.0m wide footway would be required for the full extent of the frontage. There is no footway between the site and Fairstead Lane, as such a safe walking route to school is not available and an acceptable facility doesn't appear feasible within the highway. The Street is constrained south of the site and unsuitable for development traffic.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	<p>450m walk to primary school</p> <p>Doctor surgery, local retail and employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Bus service including peak (bus stop nearby)</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 		Community centre, recreation ground and village groups within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has not confirmed services to site. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified along highway and adjacent to south western corner of site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	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	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER -This site is not acceptable in landscape terms. Development of this site would be harmful in landscape character terms. This is a gateway site with changes in levels and a solid hedgerow along the site frontage.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts may not be reasonably mitigated through design.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Pond close to western boundary. Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of LB to west. Impact may be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development 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	Red	<p>NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</p> <p>The appears site to have sufficient frontage to provide acceptable visibility but the existing frontage hedge would need to be removed, a 2.0m wide footway would be required for the full extent of the frontage. There is no footway between the site and Fairstead Lane, as such a safe walking route to school is not available and an acceptable facility doesn't appear feasible within the highway. The Street is constrained south of the site and unsuitable for development traffic.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Impact on setting of LB to west could be mitigated through design and boundary treatment. AAI to north and west of site so further investigation required.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Narrow lane with boundary hedgerow slightly raised from carriageway. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable and impact on local network.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture to south, west and north and residential development to east.	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 (including trees) to eastern, western and southern boundaries. Northern boundary open.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant hedgerow along highway boundary. Pond close to western boundary	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views from north and prominent in views from the highway	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site adjacent to bus stop but lack of continuous footpath affects accessibility to other local services. Not likely to be achievable due to lack of land and third party ownerships. Separation from nearest development to south and density as promoted would have adverse impact on form and character of settlement. Loss of some significant hedgerow to provide visibility would also adversely affect character of lane.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open countryside		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

The site is not considered suitable for allocation due to issues of townscape, landscape and connectivity. Heritage and highways issues would also constrain development.

Site Visit Observations

Site adjacent to bus stop but lack of continuous footpath affects accessibility to other local services. Not likely to be achievable due to lack of land and third party ownerships. Separation from nearest development to south and density as promoted would have adverse impact on form and character of settlement. Loss of some significant hedgerow to provide visibility would also adversely affect character of lane.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

No additional supporting evidence submitted.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** and is not suitable for inclusion as an allocation. The site relates poorly to the existing services, including the primary school, and would have a poor relationship with the existing form and character of the settlement. Development of this site would be harmful in landscape character terms; the site is open in views from the north and west with prominent in views from the highway.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 15 September 2020

SN1018

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1018
Site address	Land south of Millfields
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approx. 75 dwellings = 25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS- Red Not possible to achieve acceptable visibility for access within highway or site frontage. Field Lane is narrow with no footway. There is no safe walking route to the catchment school.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	<p>800m walk to primary school</p> <p>Doctor surgery, local retail and employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Peak bus service (400m walk to stop)</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Community centre, recreation ground and village groups within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has not confirmed any utilities to site. No other constraints identified	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Low risk of flooding. No other risk identified	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grades 3	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Detrimental impacts on character of river valley may not be reasonably mitigated due to scale of development promoted. Impacts may be limited by reduced site area.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts on form and character of settlement. Impacts may be limited by reduced site area.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of heritage asset to north but impact could be mitigated depending upon scale of development. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	May impact on setting of the listed mill depending on scale of any development	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access very constrained. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable. Development would limit access to remaining farmland	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential development to east and north. Agriculture to west and south - compatible	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 and fencing. Open to south	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Any trees/hedgerow to boundaries only	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of constraints	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views from south and from river valley to west	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Reasonable walking route to primary school but some footpath improvement required. Accessible to other local services. Significant landscape and townscape impacts due to scale of development promoted. Access and heritage constraints also identified	Green

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open countryside		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	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 for allocation at this time. Significant impact on form and character of settlement due to scale of development promoted. A reduced site area (eastern section only) would also have significant access constraints.

Site Visit Observations

Safe walking route to primary school but some footpath improvement required. Accessible to other local services. Significant landscape and townscape impacts due to scale of development promoted. Access and heritage constraints also identified.

Local Plan Designations

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Access very constrained. Improvements likely to require third party land.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** due to the significant highway safety issues and constraints resulting from the narrow width of the access off Field Lane with no footway. It has also been considered that visibility is not achievable within highway and site frontage. Even with a reduction in site size, the highway issues are considered to be unresolvable.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 21 August 2020

SN2029SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2029SL (site 1) (assessed with SN2146)
Site address	West of Topcroft Street, Toftcroft
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic approval and refusal for residential
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6 ha (over 3 sites)
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	At least 5 dwellings (over 3 sites)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield/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	Existing accesses also serving residential/farm. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development NCC HIGHWAYS – Red Site remote from local services and catchment primary school. No continuous footway to catchment school. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of its road width and lack of footways. Access would require localised carriageway widening, 2m frontage footway and removal of frontage hedge.	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>More than 3km km walk to primary school</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Limited bus service</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 		Village hall within 1800m	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Site 1 within FZ 2 & 3. All sites within identified SW flow path	Red

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: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development of the site may have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets but the impact could be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Site 1 -agriculture/residential Sites 2 & 3 – residential/paddock	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site 1 – likely to harm open setting of HA immediately to north. Sites 2 & 3 – harm to nearest HAs could be mitigated through design	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing accesses shared with farm/residential uses. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site bounded by hedgerow with trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site 1 enclosed by hedgerow with some trees. Access improvement would result in some loss. Sites 2 & 3 open to road with some trees to northern and western boundaries.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	All sites prominent in views from highway	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Sites on limited bus route but remote from most local services including school. All sites constrained by identified flood risk. Development on site 1 would be likely to harm setting of HAs. Townscape impact of development on Sites 2 & 3 could be mitigated through design but development of site 1 would result in encroachment to north.	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	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable for allocation due lack of connectivity to local services and impacts on townscape, landscape, heritage assets and flood risk.

Site Visit Observations

Sites on limited bus route but remote from most local services including school. All sites constrained by identified flood risk. Development on site 1 would be likely to harm setting of HAs. Townscape impact of development on Sites 2 & 3 could be mitigated through design but development of site 1 would result in encroachment to north.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

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 a SL Extension. The site relates poorly to the existing services, including the local school which is over a 3km walk where there is no continuous footpath. It has also been noted that the development would impact on the heritage asset immediately north, where there are also concerns that development here would result in encroachment. The site has also been identified to fall within Flood Zone 2 and 3 which could heavily constrain developable land.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

SN2046

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2046
Site address	Land at Pear Tree Farm, Hempnall
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Article 4 direction. Historic refusals for residential development. 2016/2988 Class Q prior approval for barn conversion.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.5 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified (25 dph = 27 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield/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 from Alburgh Road and field access from Lundy Green. NCC HIGHWAYS – A satisfactory access may be feasible but would require removal of frontage hedge/trees and provision of a 2.0m wide footway. 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 safe walking route to the catchment school.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>2.5 km walk to primary school</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Bus service including peak</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 		Pub within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Area of identified flood risk along eastern boundary.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact which may be mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development of the site may have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development would not have a detrimental impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets. NCC HEC - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Not likely to have any direct impacts on heritage assets.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing residential and field access. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture with residential/commercial on east side of crossroads.	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)	Site bounded by hedgerow with trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site bounded by hedgerows with some significant trees also within southern half of site. Pond in western section of site. Some loss of trees and hedgerow likely for access improvements	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence although previous agricultural activity may result in some contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site visually contained but prominent in views from highway	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Development at scale promoted would have suburbanising effect outside settlement boundary. Trees and pond within site would constrain developable area. NCC to comment on impact on local highway network.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open countryside		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable for allocation due lack of connectivity and impacts on townscape, landscape, trees and ecology. Highways issues also likely to constrain development at scale promoted.

Site Visit Observations

Site on bus route but lack of continuous footpath affecting accessibility to other local services. Development at scale promoted would have suburbanising effect outside settlement boundary. Trees and pond within site would constrain developable area. NCC to comment on impact on local highway network.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

No additional supporting evidence submitted.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** option for a settlement limit extension due to its poor connectivity and relationship to services, including the primary school. There is also no safe walking route to the catchment school. The site is heavily constrained by significant tree cover within the southern half of the site and by a pond located within the western section of the site (where is also identified surface water risk). This would reduce the area of developable land.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 18 November 2020

SN2081

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2081
Site address	West of Feld Lane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.39 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approx. 40 dwellings = 17 dph (25 dph = 59 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Field access at northern end.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Field Lane becomes constrained at the southern extent of the built area with an apparent available width of 6m, this may affect the ability to provide the required 5.5m c/w plus 2m f/w. In addition to the site frontage, footway would need to be provided to link with existing facility, approx. 300m.</p> <p>Updated comments - strong objections to this site, the road has high banks/hedging and no footway. Likely that most/all frontage trees/hedge would need to be removed. Even if this were possible, there still looks to be a constraint at the northern end of the site.</p>	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>950m walk to primary school</p> <p>Doctor surgery, local retail and employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Peak bus service (500m walk to stop)</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 		Community centre, recreation ground and village groups within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewer and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified in NW and SW sections and along Field Lane	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may not be reasonably mitigated due to scale of development promoted. Impacts may be limited by reduced site area.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts on form and character of settlement. Impacts may be limited by reduced site area.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of heritage asset to north but impact could be mitigated depending upon scale of development NCC HEC - Amber SNC Heritage Officer – Amber No objections.	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impact on listed buildings although archaeological investigation will be required.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access at northern end. During 2019 assessments, NCC expressed concern whether safe access could be achieved – confirm this.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential development to north and south. Agriculture to west and east - compatible	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)	Boundaries enclosed by hedgerow	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Well established hedgerow along boundary with lane	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	O/H lines and telegraph poles along eastern boundary with lane	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Visually contained by hedgerows but prominent in views along lane	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Reasonable walking route to primary school and accessible to other local services but some footpath improvement required. Development of whole site would have a significant impact on form and character of settlement. Hedgerow along Field Lane should be retained	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open countryside		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

Subject to a reduction in scale the site is considered suitable for allocation for up to 20 dwellings in eastern section only, subject to satisfactory access, footpath improvements and retention of hedgerow along lane.

Site Visit Observations

Reasonable walking route to primary school and accessible to other local services but footpath improvement required. Development of whole site would have a significant impact on form and character of settlement. Hedgerow along Field Lane should be retained.

Local Plan Designations

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Subject to achieving safe access – obtain early comments from NCC.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** as an allocated site due to unresolvable highway issues. The site is accessed via Field Lane to the west which has banks/hedging and no footway. It is considered that most/all frontage trees/hedge would need to be removed in order to create a satisfactory access where it has been advised that hedgerow along Field Lane should be retained. Landscape constraints have identified that development of site would have a significant impact on form and character of settlement.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 21 August 2020

SN2146

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2146 (site 2 and 3) (assessed with SN2029)
Site address	West of The Street
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic approval and refusal for residential
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6 ha (over 3 sites)
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	At least 5 dwellings (over 3 sites)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield/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	Existing accesses also serving residential/farm. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development. NCC HIGHWAY – red Site remote from local services and catchment primary school. No continuous footway to catchment school. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of its road width and lack of footways. Access would require localised carriageway widening, 2m frontage footway and removal of frontage hedge.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>More than 3km km walk to primary school</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Limited bus service</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 		Village hall within 1800m	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Site 1 within FZ 2 & 3. All sites within identified SW flow path	Red

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: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development of the site may have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets but the impact could be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Site 1 -agriculture/residential Sites 2 & 3 – residential/paddock	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site 1 – likely to harm open setting of HA immediately to north. Sites 2 & 3 – harm to nearest HAs could be mitigated through design	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing accesses shared with farm/residential uses. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site bounded by hedgerow with trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site 1 enclosed by hedgerow with some trees. Access improvement would result in some loss. Sites 2 & 3 open to road with some trees to northern and western boundaries.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	All sites prominent in views from highway	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Sites on limited bus route but remote from most local services including school. All sites constrained by identified flood risk. Development on site 1 would be likely to harm setting of HAs. Townscape impact of development on Sites 2 & 3 could be mitigated through design but development of site 1 would result in encroachment to north.	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	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No supporting information submitted	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Access would require localised carriageway widening, 2m frontage footway and removal of frontage hedge.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considered a suitable size for a SL Extension. The site lacks connectivity to local services and impacts on townscape, landscape and heritage assets have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Sites on limited bus route but remote from most local services including school. All sites constrained by identified flood risk. Development on site 1 would be likely to harm setting of HAs. Townscape impact of development on Sites 2 & 3 could be mitigated through design but development of site 1 would result in encroachment to north.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

No additional supporting evidence submitted.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered an **UNREASONABLE** option for an extension to the existing settlement limit, due to highway constraints. Development of the site would also conflict with the linear pattern of development with potential harm to the character of the settlement. The site relates poorly to the existing services, including the local school which is a 3km walk and has no continuous footpath link. Heritage and surface water flood issues have been identified; however, these could be mitigated.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

SN4012

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4012
Site address	Land west of Low Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.57 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	Allocated
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	At least 12 dwellings = 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	Field access at junction of Low Road/Church Lane. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	More than 3km walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 1800m Limited bus service	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Village hall within 1800m	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, foul drainage and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Within flood zone 1. Identified SW flood risk along adjacent highways and adjoining land to NE.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development of the site may have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets but the impact could be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts on designated or non-designated HAs	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access on junction. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable from either road. Some oak on boundaries that may impact visibility.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries open to highways and adjoining land. Field oak dispersed along both highway boundaries.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Field oak along highway boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	O/H lines along Church lane frontage	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from highways and adjoining land	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site remote from most local services including school. Development at scale promoted would have suburbanising effect and harm open character of landscape. Likely to have adverse impact on local highway network.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open countryside		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable for allocation due lack of connectivity to local services and impacts on townscape, landscape, heritage assets and flood risk.

Site Visit Observations

Site remote from most local services including school. Development at scale promoted would have suburbanising effect and harm open character of landscape. Likely to have adverse impact on local highway network.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

No additional supporting evidence submitted.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation or inclusion in settlement limit due to its remoteness from the services and facilities within the village cluster, exacerbated by the lack of footways. The site is also considered to be out of keeping in terms of form and character, whilst the site is adjacent to residential dwellings, the site is detached from the main part of Topcroft to the south.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

SN4083

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4083
Site address	Land at Bungay Road, Hempnall
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9 ha (estimated, not confirmed by promoter)
Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified (25 dph = 22 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Shared access from Bungay Road. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	700m walk to primary school Employment opportunities within 1800m Bus service	

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 		Village hall within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter has not confirmed utilities. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Western side of site within FZs 2 & 3. Identified SW flood risk across western and northern sections and along highway. No supporting evidence submitted.</p> <p>LLFA – Amber</p> <p>Mitigation required for heavy constraints. Significant information required at a planning stage. The site is adjacent to significant flooding (flowpath). This must be considered in the site assessment.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B1: Tas tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development of the site may have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets but the impact could be mitigated. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Would have impact on setting of LB to west. Would only be mitigated by design and reduction in site area	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing shared access onto Bungay Road. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open to highways and remaining boundaries enclosed by hedgerow with some trees.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Watercourse along northern boundary. Several trees along northern and eastern boundaries.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from highways and adjoining land	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site reasonably close to local services. No footpath provision for first 50m and no land appears available for improvements. Frontage development only would reflect existing pattern of development and limit landscape and heritage impacts. Appear to be significant flood risk constraints. No supporting information submitted in this respect.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open countryside		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Not confirmed	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years. Not confirmed.	Amber

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 supporting information submitted	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Not confirmed	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No evidence	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable for allocation at scale promoted due lack of connectivity and impacts on townscape, landscape, heritage assets and flood risk.

Site Visit Observations

Site reasonably close to local services. No footpath provision for first 50m and no land appears available for improvements. Frontage development only would reflect existing pattern of development and limit townscape, landscape and heritage impacts. Appear to be significant flood risk constraints. No supporting information submitted in this respect.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

No additional supporting evidence submitted.

Achievability

No additional supporting evidence submitted.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** site for allocation. Frontage development would limit landscape and heritage impacts, however identified flood risk constraints are likely to restrict development on the western part of the site which is closest to the existing settlement. This could result in a poor relationship between new development and existing development along Bungay Road. Whilst the site is reasonably close to local services there is no footpath provision for the first 50m of the site and there appears to be no land available for improvements.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

SN5012SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5012SL
Site address	Land north of Freyja, The Street, Topcroft
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	1987/0803/O for 2 dwellings, refused 03/06/1987.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.1
Promoted Site Use, including (aa) Allocated site (bb) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	4 2-3 at 25pdh
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	Flood Zone 2 & 3
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing access from The Street would need to be improved. NCC Highways – Red. Visibility poor, network poor, no footway to catchment school.	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 	Red	More than 3km walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 1800m Limited bus service	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	Village hall/playing field to rear	Amber
Utilities Capacity			
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states water, electric and broadband available, unknown for mains sewerage.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	None identified. Previous building on site.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Red	<p>Flood Zone 2 & 3</p> <p>Surface water flooding; 1:100 risk across the whole site and 1:30 & 1:100 in the north-west corner.</p> <p>LLFA – Red. Surface water flooding which would prevent development. The site is affected by a major flow path in the 0.1% AEP event. In the 3.33% and 1.0% AEP events the site is affected by a smaller extent of a larger off-site flow path. The 0.1% AEP event flow path covers the entire site. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows northeast through the site. This needs to be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>Access to the site appears to be heavily affected by the on-site and off-site flood risk in all events.</p> <p>We would strongly advise this site is removed from the plan.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Amber In Flood Zone 2 and 3. This site would require a site specific Flood Risk Assessment at application stage. Any proposals should follow the sequential approach to site layout.</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>East half; B4 – Waveney Tributary Farmland</p> <p>West half; B1 – Tas Tributary Farmland</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	Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; non-agriculture	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is an existing fenced in area, well contained and would not impact on the landscape.	Green
Townscape	Green	The site is close to existing dwellings with the playing field behind. It is on the edge of the development boundary and would relate well to the settlement here.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Currently unused area, some limited potential for habitat. NCC Ecologist: Green. No PROW. SSSI IRZ but residential and water discharge does not require NE consultation. Within GI corridor and orange risk zone for great crested newts.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets affected. HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No. Formal open space adjacent to rear.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Site remote from local services and catchment primary school. No continuous footway to catchment school. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of its road width and lack of footways. NCC Highways – Red. Visibility poor, network poor, no footway to catchment school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and playing field.	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?	Appears possible as existing access on frontage to The Street. Narrow roads surrounding the area, unlit and no footpaths.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Vacant land, may have had some building on previously.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and playing field – compatible uses.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level and flat.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Fence to dwelling on south. Hedges on all other sides.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Tress within hedge to north.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Telegraph line along frontage. No evidence of contamination.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views into and out of site because of boundaries which contain it. Site has pleasant views to south-east over playing field.	N/A
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	The site is well contained and adjacent to a dwelling. However, it is not well connected to local services and the surrounding road network is narrow with no paths. The site is in Flood Zones 2&3 which would prevent development.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Adjacent to: Topcroft Sports Field/Formal Open Space		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private – promoter states it is owned by a developer.	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	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is unsuitable for a settlement limit extension.

Site Visit Observations

The site is well contained and adjacent to a dwelling. However, it is not well connected to local services and the surrounding road network is narrow with no paths.

Local Plan Designations

Open Countryside (adjacent to Topcroft Sports Field/Formal Open Space)

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** site for a Settlement Limit Extension. The site relates poorly to the existing services, including the local school which is over a 3km walk where there is no continuous footpath or lighting. This is considered to be unsuitable and presents highway safety concerns. The site has also been identified within Flood Zone 2 and 3 where there is also a risk of surface water flooding. Whilst in some cases this can be mitigated, the combined impact with location and highways the site has been assessed unsuitable for a settlement limit extension.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022

SN5056SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5056SL
Site address	Land at Gardeners Cottage, The Street, Topcroft Street
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside Development Boundary
Planning History	1987/0991/O for a dwelling refused 03/06/1987. 2017/0094/H for an outbuilding approved 09/03/2017. Part retrospective.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.08Ha
Promoted Site Use, including (cc) Allocated site (dd) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for a single self-build dwelling (1-2dwellings @ 25dph)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing gated access to the north of the site serving outbuilding. NCC Highways – Green. Subject to provision of acceptable visibility splays, but that is reliant on removal of all frontage hedging and trees, some of those trees appear to be significant.	Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	More than 3km km walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 1800m Limited bus service	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	Village hall within 1800m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utility capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Adjacent to existing properties.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1 Low risk of surface water flooding along frontage with road.</p> <p>LLFA – Amber. Significant mitigation required for severe constraints. Significant information required at a planning stage. A small area of the site is affected by flood risk in the 0.1% AEP event. However, this flood risk is associated with a major flow path immediately adjacent to the site with a small area encroaching on the north-western site boundary along The Street. The flow path appears in the 3.33% AEP event increasing in size through the 1.0% and 0.1% AEP events. Though the actual site appears to only partially be affected by flood risk, the flow path has potential to impact the site or, subsequently, development of the site impact the flow path. We would require significant information at a planning stage and would advise this is considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>Access to the site could be significantly impacted by on/off-site flood risk. We would advise this is considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>A large area of the site is covered by 'pond' features. This would make us question the feasibility of the site for significant development and must be considered in the site assessment.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland No loss of agricultural land	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site forms part of the setting of the listed building to the south and has previously been excluded from the settlement limit. There are mature trees along the frontage and this site adds to the verdant appearance along this part of the street which would be reduced if developed and it may not be possible to mitigate this impact.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Topcroft Street is characterised by linear development of mainly detached properties on large plots, generally set back from the frontage. Linear development would be in keeping with the general character of the village providing it was low density and could be set well back from the frontage similar to the properties adjacent to the site – the depth of the plot may mean that this could not be achieved satisfactorily.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	There are large mature trees and ponds present which have good potential for habitat. Would need further investigation. Concern that development is likely to put the TPOs at risk. NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ but residential and water discharge does not trigger NE consultation. two ponds on site and in amber risk zone for great crested newts. Also in GI corridor. No PROW.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Grade II listed building immediately to south, development would have an impact on its setting.</p> <p>Area of Archaeological Interest to east of site, may require investigation.</p> <p>Technical views of the Senior Conservation and Design Officer would be required if this site is considered to be suitable to progress.</p> <p>HES – Amber. adj. to site of medieval chapel - possible human burials.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Site remote from local services and catchment primary school. No continuous footway to catchment school. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of its road width and lack of footways. NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. The Street appears to narrow in front of the site, localised widening may be required at the frontage to address this and provide safe access.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential – no compatibility issues	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2011 & planning application records)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Would be an impact on the adjacent listed building 'Gardeners Cottage', of which this land would historically been part of the garden. This is an attractive site with large, mature trees which adds significantly to the character of the village.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	There is an existing access to the site separate from the access to Gardeners Cottage. Highway Authority would need to confirm if safe access is achievable.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Garden	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential which is compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level and flat.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge and TPO trees to road frontage, hedge to south. Outbuilding and vegetation to north.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant mature trees along frontage, on adjacent site and hedging on boundaries. Ponds present.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No utilities evident and reason to suspect contamination.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views into and out of the site due to the substantial trees and other planting. The site itself is prominent in the street scene and adds greatly to the character of this narrow, rural street.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2011 & planning application records)	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 in a line of dwellings however it is remote from services, including the school which is around 3km and in any case it is not possible to walk safely as there are no paths or street-lights. It is therefore not a sustainable location as the majority of journeys would have to be by vehicle.</p> <p>The site has historically been excluded from the settlement limit and makes a substantial contribution to the character of the street, particularly with its trees, as well as being part of the setting for the attractive listed building adjacent. Any further development would put the TPOs at risk.</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)	Unknown	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Unknown	Amber

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unknown	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Settlement limit extension therefore not relevant	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 – Conclusion

Suitability

The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement boundary for Topcroft and is of a suitable size for a SL extension. However, the site is constrained with high surface water flooding, as raised by the LLFA in their technical response. The site is within the setting of a listed building and development of the site would have a significant impact on the setting of this heritage asset. The trees along the site frontage are subject to TPOS and alongside the listed building make a significant contribution to the character of the area. In terms of highways matters, site access would require the removal of these trees and pedestrian connectivity of the site has also been identified as a constraint.

Site Visit Observations

The site is in a line of dwellings however it is remote from services, including the school which is around 3km and in any case it is not possible to walk safely as there are no paths or street-lights. This site makes a substantial contribution to the character of the street, particularly with its trees, as well as being part of the setting for the attractive listed building adjacent. Linear development would be in character however development on this site may not be set back within its plot in line with the dwellings adjacent to the plot.

Local Plan Designations

None.

Availability

The site is available.

Achievability

The site is noted as being achievable however it is unclear how access to the site would be achieved without impacting on the TPO trees.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is **UNREASONABLE** as a settlement limit extension. Whilst the site is located adjacent to the existing settlement boundary for Topcroft it has historically been excluded from the settlement limit as it makes a substantial contribution to the character of the street, particularly with its protected trees along its frontage, as well as being part of the setting for the attractive adjacent listed building. In addition, the LLFA have raised surface flood issues on the site which would require significant mitigation. Though the actual site appears to only partially be affected by flood risk, the flow path has potential to impact the site or, subsequently, development of the site impact the flow path. The benefits of including this site within the settlement limit (self-build opportunity, single dwelling) are outweighed by the disadvantages and as such the site is considered unsuitable for development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022