



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Site Assessments

Keswick and Intwood

Contents

SN0012SL	3
SN2014	13
SN4081	22
SN5042	32

SN0012SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0012SL
Site address	Land at Eaton Gate, Low Road, Keswick
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated – self build consent implemented
Planning History	2020/1846 Compliance with condition 1 of planning permission 2018/1835. Approved 2018/1835 Demolition of existing stables, to erect a self-built single family two storey dwelling. Approved
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.24ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 4 dwellings – assume 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield, however planning consent implemented

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	Not in the main site but to the northern boundary
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	Unlikely to be able to achieve acceptable visibility to either Mill Lane, or Low Road NCC HIGHWAYS – Red Unlikely to be able to achieve acceptable visibility to either Mill Lane, or Low Road. No walking route to 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 		Bus stop within 690m 37 & 37B Cringleford primary School 3.34km Doctors 2.33km	

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 		Cringleford Willow Centre and Recreational ground 3.21km Range of services in Cringleford within 3km Keswick playgroup and village Hall 504m Tesco's 1.39km	Green
Utilities Capacity		Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure		Assume water and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability		The site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk		The site is partially located within Flood Zone 2 and mainly in the Flood Zone 1, but the site lies adjacent to flood zones 2 and 3, with the access to the site falling within these flood zones. SFRA2/SFA3a/SFRA3b to the northern boundary. Surface Water drainage flooding 1:100, 1-1000, 1-30 and flood hazard to the northern 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	Valley Urban Fringe	Not applicable

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		F1 – Yare Valley Urban Fringe.	
Overall Landscape Assessment		<p>The application site lies within the Yare Valley Urban Fringe landscape character area. This area is characterised by its valley form, perceived absence of settlement, sense of inaccessibility, green buffer to the City, post-war and more modern developments and distinctive vernacular buildings. The key design principles for development in this location are maintaining the relative absence of development; ensure new development does not adversely impact the open character of the valley; and ensure open views to and from the southern bypass.</p> <p>Whilst one dwelling was considered to be largely screened by existing trees and would also be viewed on the backdrop of existing dwellings. A higher density would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated and likely to significantly encroach on the river valley.</p>	Red
Townscape		<p>The site lies to the north east of Keswick Old Hall, a large grade II listed house to the South West of the site, and Hall Farm directly to the south with a large complex of converted barns. The site forms part of the landscaped setting to the north of these building with mature trees.</p> <p>Located some way from the existing development boundary and this part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity		Development may impact on protected species, which may be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment		<p>Adjacent to the grounds of Keswick Old Hall. Therefore, the development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby listed but could be reasonably mitigated</p> <p>NCC HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space		Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads		<p>The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or lack of footpath provision.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS - Red</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses		Residential and Agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>The site lies to the north east of Keswick Old Hall, a large grade II listed house to the South West of the site, and Hall Farm directly to the south with a large complex of converted barns. The site forms part of the landscaped setting to the north of these building with mature trees.</p> <p>Technical office to assess impact on listed buildings. The development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby listed but could be reasonably mitigated</p> <p>Located some way from the existing development boundary and this part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.</p> <p>It is also noted that the character of the adjacent Eaton Gate, a former group of barn buildings which have been converted and extended, the consented dwelling is unlikely to be clearly visible from any public vantage point with Eaton Gate being a private drive and located a significant distance down the access off Mill Lane. There are a number of trees around the site which would help to screen the proposals. The scale, height and massing of the consented was considered appropriate in relation to neighbourhood properties. However, a development of more than this would have a detrimental impact</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Unlikely to be able to achieve acceptable visibility to either Mill Lane, or Low Road	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Planning consent of the consented dwelling has been implemented	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and Agricultural	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)	The site is largely screened from the surrounding area by existing trees and vegetation and existing boundary treatments. There is an existing gate off Eaton Gate private drive which does provide access to the site.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	A higher density will require the removal of the existing trees and vegetation within the site.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is reasonably contained and boarded by conversions.	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)	<p>The site is largely screened from the surrounding area by existing trees and vegetation and existing boundary treatments. There is an existing gate off Eaton Gate private drive which does provide access to the site.</p> <p>Located some way from the existing development boundary and this part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character. The proposal would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated as it is for a more dense development which would require the removal of trees and vegetation within the site. The site is suitable for only one dwelling.</p>	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not suitable, for more than the one consented dwelling due to site constraints – trees, size of the site, context of the area, access etc. Which would result in potential adverse impacts on landscape and townscape. Equally Highway safety.

Site Visit Observations

The site is largely screened from the surrounding area by existing trees and vegetation and existing boundary treatments. There is an existing gate off Eaton Gate private drive which does provide access to the site.

Local Plan Designations

Open Countryside.

Availability

That information is not available to me.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for a settlement limit extension. The site is not suitable for more than the one consented dwelling due to significant site constraints including tree cover, flood issues, landscape and access. A higher density development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated and likely to significantly encroach on the river valley. Whilst the site is part of a smaller group of dwellings, it is separated from the main village and the existing development boundary where this part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character. Highways have raised concerns with visibility to either Mill Lane, or Low Road.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 08/01/2021

SN2014

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2014
Site address	Land at Intwood Road, Keswick
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	<p>2007/2032 Change of use of land for keeping of horses and erection of a stable block. Approved</p> <p>2011/0159 Re-instatement of abandoned road access to woodland site and installation of farm gate and vehicle hard-standing. Approved</p> <p><u>Land to the north immediately adjacent the site:</u></p> <p>2020/1220 Change of use of woodland to run a small forest school business, with a view to using woodland to deliver forest schooling for home educated children, special educational needs groups, stay and play, playgroups, woodland parties, private sessions and weekend retreats. with enhanced planting. Approved</p>
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.14ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocated
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12 – 25 dwellings and office development – assume 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	Green	NCC HIGHWAYS - Red Intwood Rd vertical & horizontal alignment present challenges for visibility. No connecting footway back to settlement, provision does not appear feasible.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Cringleford stores 706m Bus stop within 388m 10A Network Norwich Cringleford primary School 2.15km Doctors 1.23km No footpaths until you get to Cringleford	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Cringleford Willow Centre and Recreational ground 2.05km Range of services in Cringleford within 3km Keswick playgroup and village Hall 1.60km Tesco's 3.21km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area served by fibre technology/planned upgrade	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field for keeping of horses and no known ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1, surface water flooding on the site depth 1.1000.	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 with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C1 - Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Within the Strategic gap which looks to retain the openness of the gap and the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone which seeks to retain the openness of the zone and where possible enhance the landscape setting of the southern bypass.</p> <p>Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated</p>	Amber/Red
Townscape	Green	The site is detached from the main part of the village. The site is currently used for agricultural with significant trees. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.	Amber/Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>County Wildlife site 'Carr Wood' adjacent to the southeast</p> <p>Development may impact on protected species, which may be reasonably mitigated</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby listed buildings and the archaeology but could be reasonably mitigated</p> <p>NCC HES – Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or lack of footpath provision.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Red</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Planning permission for a forest school to the north and railway line beyond. Agricultural	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical office to assess impact on listed buildings and archaeology. Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby listed buildings and the archaeology but could be reasonably mitigated</p> <p>The site is detached from the main part of the village. The site is currently used as an agricultural field for keeping of horses with significant trees. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Intwood Rd vertical & horizontal alignment present challenges for visibility. No connecting footway back to settlement, provision does not appear feasible.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Keeping of horses/agricultural grade 3	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Planning permission for a forest school to the north and railway line beyond. Agricultural	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Land slopes south to north but relatively flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Substantial trees, hedgerows to the northern, western boundaries. Open to the adjoining field to the east, trees and vegetation within the site to the south	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant trees to the boundaries and hedgerow/trees within the site itself.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Electricity pole on the southern part of the site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Although significant trees to the northern and western boundaries, the site is clearly visible from Intwood Lane through access and public footpath	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not adjacent to the development boundary, remote and separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network and footpath. Within the strategic gap and landscape protection zone and therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.	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)
Strategic gap		
Norwich Southern Bypass Protection Zone		
Open Countryside		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Likely off-site highway improvements. NCC to confirm Electricity pole relocation?	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Can not confirm the site is viable	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable, due to remote/separation from the main village, no existing development boundary. Potential adverse impacts on Heritage assets, landscape and highway safety.

Site Visit Observations

Not adjacent to the development boundary, remote and separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network and footpath. Within the strategic gap and landscape protection zone and therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

Local Plan Designations

Within the open countryside, Strategic gap and Norwich Southern Bypass protection Zone.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. The site has a poor relationship with existing development, both in terms of form and connectivity as well as being located within the Strategic gap and the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone which seeks to retain the openness of the zone and where possible enhance the landscape setting of the southern bypass. The site is detached from the main part of the village where this part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character. Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated. Highways have also raised concerns with the current road alignment of Intwood Road which challenges for visibility.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

SN4081

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4081
Site address	Land to east of Intwood Road, Keswick
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2019/2370 Erection of one agricultural building. Approved <u>Site adjacent with access running immediately adjacent this site</u> 2016/1139 Erection of new pre-fabricated building for dog training and day time kennelling with ancillary car park and use of land for Happy Pets. Approved
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocated
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	28 dwellings self-build – however assume 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 but an archaeological site
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	NCC HIGHWAYS – Red Intwood Rd vertical & horizontal alignment present challenges for visibility. No acceptable access, or safe walking route to school.	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>Cringleford stores 721m</p> <p>Bus stop within 550m 10A Network Norwich</p> <p>Cringleford primary School 2.33km</p> <p>Doctors 1.41km</p> <p>No footpaths until you get to Cringleford</p>	Amber
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Cringleford Willow Centre and Recreational ground 2.23km</p> <p>Range of services in Cringleford within 3km</p> <p>Keswick playgroup and village Hall 1.75km</p> <p>Tesco's 3.36km</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity		Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure		Promoter advises water and electricity available to site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area served by fibre technology/planned upgrade	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability		The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk		<p>Flood zone 1, surface water flood risk, 1.100 and 1.1000 to the east, with a small area in the middle of the eastern boundary.</p> <p>LLFA – Green</p> <p>Few or no constraints Standard information required at a planning stage</p>	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 with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		C1 - Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment		<p>Within the Strategic gap which looks to retain the openness of the gap and the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone which seeks to retain the openness of the zone and where possible enhance the landscape setting of the southern bypass.</p> <p>Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated</p>	Amber/Red
Townscape		The site is detached from the main part of the village. The site is currently used for agricultural set back from the road and adjacent a CWS with significant trees. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.	Amber/Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity		County Wildlife site 'Carr Wood' adjacent to the east. Development may impact on protected species, which may be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment		Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby listed buildings and the archaeology but could be reasonably mitigated NCC HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space		Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads		The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or lack of footpath provision. NCC HIGHWAYS - Red	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses		Agricultural and CWS	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical office to assess impact on listed buildings and archaeology. Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby listed buildings and the archaeology but could be reasonably mitigated</p> <p>The site is detached from the main part of the village. The site is currently used for agricultural set back from the road and adjacent a CWS with significant trees. This part of the village retains its predominantly dispersed rural character.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Intwood Rd vertical & horizontal alignment present challenges for visibility. No connecting footway back to settlement, provision does not appear feasible.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural grade 3	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and CWS	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)	Woodland to the eastern boundary, access road/track to the north, open to the west and south where it adjoins the neighbouring field	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant trees/woodland to east within CWS	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Public footpath runs along north to south to west separated by a field, the site is clearly visible from Intwood Lane through access and public footpath	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	<p>It is accessed from Intwood Road via a track. The remainder of the field lies to the east, south and north; woodland is located to the east. A Public Right of Way runs alongside the western and southern boundaries of the wider field.</p> <p>Not adjacent to the development boundary, remote and separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network and footpath. Within the strategic gap and landscape protection zone and therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.</p>	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Strategic gaps between settlements within the Norwich Policy Area		
Southern Bypass Protection Zone		
Open Countryside		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private but has a shared access at entrance from Intwood Road	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	5 – 10 years	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)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Likely off-site highway improvements. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Can not confirm the site is viable	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable, due to remote/separation from the main village, no existing development boundary. Potential adverse impacts on Heritage assets, landscape and highway safety.

Site Visit Observations

It is accessed from Intwood Road via a track. The remainder of the field lies to the east, south and north; woodland is located to the east. A Public Right of Way runs alongside the western and southern boundaries of the wider field.

Not adjacent to the development boundary, remote and separated from the main part of the village. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. Views of the site are afforded from the surrounding road network and footpath. Within the strategic gap and landscape protection zone and therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

Local Plan Designations

Within the open countryside, Strategic gap and Norwich Southern Bypass protection Zone.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability 5 – 10 years.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. The site is located within the Strategic gap and the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone which seeks to retain the openness of the zone and where possible enhance the landscape setting of the southern bypass. In addition, the site is located adjacent to a County Wildlife site 'Carr Wood' where development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated. The site is remote from services where there is no safe walking route to school. Highways have also raised concerns with an access off Intwood Road and achieving visibility.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 08/01/2021

SN5042

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5042
Site address	Land east of Keswick Barn, Intwood
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.66
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	1-6 16.5 at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Red	No formal access. It would be along a gated, dead-end, unsurfaced lane which is also a footpath (Keswick FP8). NCC Highways – Red. No direct access to highway. Network poor, remote, no footway to school/local facilities.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities Part 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	Cringleford stores 1,570m Bus stop within 2,250m 10A Network Norwich Cringleford Primary School over 3km Doctors 2,260m No footpaths until you get to Cringleford or Swardeston. It is 1,500m to the Swardeston B1113 where there is a footpath. Bus stops, Village hall.	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	Nursery and Pavilion/Recreation Ground, range of services in Cringleford just over 2km Tesco; over 3km	Amber
Utilities Capacity		Promoter states that provision will need to be made for key utilities.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	None identified by landowner/agent	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Under consideration for further upgrades.	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No evidence of contamination or ground instability. NCC Minerals & Waste - site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that - future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1 (Flood Zone 2&3 close to the north) 1:1000 risk of surface water flooding through the centre of the site.</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Surface water flood risk, would not prevent development, standard information would be required at the planning stage. There is a major flow path immediately adjacent west of the site. This must be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>Access to the site could be severely affected by off-site flood risk.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	<p>C1 Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3</p>	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Red	<p>The site is in the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone which seeks to retain the openness of the zone and where possible enhance the landscape setting of the southern bypass.</p> <p>The site is relatively contained but residential development would significantly alter the landscape character along this secluded lane. It would be publicly visible from the footpath and close to the tributary to the north.</p> <p>Development would have a detrimental impact on the landscape which could not be reasonably mitigated.</p>	Red
Townscape	Red	Any concentration of development in this location would be out of character with the rural area. There is no nearby development aside from the adjacent dwelling which has been converted from agricultural buildings.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Environmentally Sensitive Area to north-west of site.</p> <p>There are significant tree boundaries and a woodland area nearby, along with nearby water all of which are important habitats. This site forms part of that rural landscape and network of habitats.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Green.</p> <p>No Priority habitat (MAGIC) but within GI corridor. Green risk zone for Great Crested Newts. Adjacent to PROW Keswick FP8. SSSI ISZ - but residential and discharge of water not identified for NE consultation.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Site of Archaeological Interest directly to the north, opposite.</p> <p>HES – Amber</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	<p>The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of its road width, lack of footways. Site is remote from local services and catchment primary school. No continuous footway to catchment school.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. No direct access to highway. Network poor, remote, no footway to school/local facilities.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Converted barn, agricultural, river, footpath and woodland.	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	None	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	The site does not have a frontage with an adopted road. The access would have to be significantly improved along a land which is shared with a footpath. The local roads are very narrow with no footpaths or lighting and few passing places.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture and residential, 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)	Hedges to north and west, open to field to south. Woodland to eastern side.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Yes, adjacent is an area of woodland.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence, contamination very unlikely given agricultural use of site.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views into the site given the trees adjacent to Swardeston Lane. Similarly views out would be limited apart from to the south. If developed there would be public views into the site from the footpath along the track to north.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	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)	The site is remote from services and facilities and the routes are narrow and unlit making walking difficult. It is an isolated site and development would have a significant impact on the character of the rural area as well as the landscape.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Norwich Policy Area		N/A
Norwich Southern Bypass Land Protection Zone		N/A
Viewing Cone		N/A
National Grid Overhead Line – with buffer		
Conclusion	Significant conflict with Local Plan Policies	Red

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No – state have had enquiries.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green
Comments:		N/A

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is unsuitable for allocation due to the detrimental impact on the landscape and highways issues, that are considered unresolvable through reasonable mitigation. In addition, located opposite the site is a site of Archaeological Interest directly to the north.

Site Visit Observations

The site is remote from services and facilities and the routes are narrow and unlit making walking difficult. It is an isolated site and development would have a significant impact on the character of the rural area as well as the landscape.

Local Plan Designations

The site is defined as countryside. It is also located within the following LP designations: Norwich Policy Area, Norwich Southern Bypass Land Protection Zone, Viewing Cone and National Grid Overhead Line – with buffer.

Availability

The landowner/developer has advised that the site is available now.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** for development. Development of the site for residential use would be out of character with the rural area. The site is also protected by the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone which seeks to retain the openness of the zone and where possible enhance the landscape setting of the southern bypass. It is considered that development would have a detrimental impact on the landscape which could not be reasonably mitigated. In addition, the Highways Authority have advised that there is no safe and suitable access to the site, the local network is poor with no footway (or possible provision of footway) to the school. The site is also located to the south of a Site of Archaeological Interest and has significant tree boundaries and a woodland area nearby, along with nearby water all of which are important habitats. The culminative effects of these impacts would have a negative impact on the area and as such development of the site is considered unsuitable.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022