



# Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

## Site Assessments

### Little Melton and Great Melton

## Contents

SN0182 .....	3
SN0397 .....	11
SN0454 .....	19
SN0488 .....	27
SN0591 .....	35
SN2044 .....	43
SN3001 .....	52
SN3007 .....	60
SN4052 .....	68
SN4058 .....	76

## SN0182

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0182
Site address	Land north of Mill Road, Little Melton (west of village hall and playing field), Little Melton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No recent planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocation – 25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Green	Constraints on where access can be achieved  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS - Red</b> May not be possible to achieve required visibility due to road alignment/limited length of frontage existing frontage hedge/trees - would require removal. Would require f/w to connect with existing facilities along with c/w widening, doesn't appear feasible within highway. Required highway works (if achievable within highway) would impact existing hedges & trees.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Distance to Little Melton Primary School 900 metres with footways except section closest to site</p> <p>Distance to bus service 600 metres</p> <p>Distance to shop 1.2km</p> <p>Local employment 1.3km</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Adjacent to Little Melton village hall and recreation ground</p> <p>Distance to The Village Inn public house 950 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber		Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified surface water flood risk along Mill Road by site and around pond within 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	Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is detached from settlement pattern and as such development may not ensure that distinctive settlement pattern is maintained. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Green
Townscape	Amber	Development would comprise of detached estate development not in keeping with form and character	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II* listed Church of St Mary and All Saints to west of site  <b>NCC HES- Amber</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Mill Road is constrained rural lane past site  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS - Red</b> May not be possible to achieve required visibility due to road alignment/limited length of frontage existing frontage hedge/trees - would require removal. Would require f/w to connect with existing facilities along with c/w widening, doesn't appear feasible within highway. Required highway works (if achievable within highway) would impact existing hedges & trees.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Recreation ground and agricultural land	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Detached feel of site due to rural nature of lane with playing fields in between site and existing development on northern side of lane and lack of development on southern side of lane. Also development of the site would erode the rural setting of the church to the west	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would be likely to require removal of sections of hedgerow and trees. NCC Highways would require footway and carriageway widening which they note may not be feasible within highway	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Playing field to east with agricultural land on all other sides. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Largely flat, but land starts to fall to the north	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging along highway boundary. Hedging and some smaller trees along eastern boundary with playing field. Mature trees along western boundary.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Clump of trees and bushes in middle of site which surrounds pond	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)	Oil pipeline runs through 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	Views across site from field access onto Mill Road	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable due to detached nature of site from main village and erosion of rural setting of church. Also notable constraints from development include restricted nature of Mill Road which may not be possible to mitigate, oil pipeline running through site and pond in centre of site.	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		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Improvements to Mill Road including carriageway widening and footway provision likely to be required but may not be achievable	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is of a suitable size for a settlement limit extension.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is detached from existing area of settlement and feels removed from village due to rural section of Mill Road as it passes the recreation ground. It also forms part of the rural, undeveloped setting of the church to the west. Pond surrounded by trees in centre of site.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but relatively close to the development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. Whilst the site is immediately adjacent the current settlement limit for Little Melton, it is actually appears detached from existing area of settlement to the east and feels removed from village due to the rural section of Mill Road it is accessed off. Access via Mill Road is constrained and there is concern that it may not be possible to achieve required visibility due to road alignment and limited length of frontage. Required highway works (if achievable within highway) would impact existing hedges & trees. Heritage impacts have also been highlighted in relation to the setting of the Grade I listed church immediately south of the site, concerns with the potential erosion of rural and open view in a north east direction. It has also been highlighted that there is an old oil pipeline that crosses the site which could heavily constated development.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN0397

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0397
Site address	Land north of No46 Mill Road, Little Melton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Refusal for eco-dwelling & associated education facility (2008/0249)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.5 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation – approx. 75 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	30dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Potential for creating an access is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b> No access from highway	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Little Melton Primary School 950 metres with footways  Distance to bus service 700 metres  Distance to shop 1.25km  Local employment 1.5km	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Distance to Little Melton village hall and recreation ground 70 metres  Distance to The Village Inn public house 1km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Likely that sewerage infrastructure will need to be upgraded	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter unsure if mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some small areas of identified surface water flood risk in centre of site and on 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 with Parkland and Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Mainly in C1 Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland, but with western fringe in D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would expand settlement into open plateau landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Estate development on this site would not relate well to existing linear pattern of development along Mill Road	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity  <b>NCC HES - Amber</b>	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Estate development wouldn't relate well to linear line of single storey properties to south	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No access achievable from public highway without requiring third party land	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to south, otherwise agricultural land. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and hedges along western boundary but with public footpath inside of boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on 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 of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from public footpath along western boundary of site. Views across site towards B1108 to north	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site cannot be accessed from public highway without third party land, whilst development of the site would relate poorly to existing form and character	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		
Norwich Southern Bypass Protection Zone in extreme north-eastern corner of site	Area of site is affected is so small that development can be achieved without conflict with this policy	
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Whilst the site could be reduced in size and scale, to be in accordance with the objectives of the VCHAP (to be allocated for up to 25 dwelling), there is no means access to the site.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is at the end of a restricted driveway serving a linear line of dwellings. Access would therefore be difficult and estate development of the site would not relate well to existing form and character.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to the development boundary. Very small portion of site is in the Norwich Southern Bypass Protection Zone but this can be mitigated against given the size of the area affected.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development, due to unresolvable access constraints. The site is located to the end of a restricted driving where access to the site could require 3<sup>rd</sup> party land, which at this stage has not been identified by the promoter. The site is situated to the north of existing linear residential dwellings where development of the site would relate poorly to the existing form and character. There are few other constraints.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN0454

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0454
Site address	Keyline Builders Site, Little Melton Road, Beckhithe, Little Melton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Previous planning applications associated with commercial use of site (most recent 2018/1306)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.845 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation – 34 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Brownfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing access to site is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b> Visibility requires sight lines over 3rd party land.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Little Melton Primary School 1.25km, majority without footway  Distance to bus service 200 metres  Distance to shop 1.5km  Adjacent to local employment	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Distance to Little Melton village hall and recreation ground 1.6km  Distance to The Village Inn public house 1.3km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity would need to be demonstrated	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Potential contamination issues from existing use	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained within landscape and relates to existing cluster of development. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Poor relationship to existing settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity  <b>NCC HES – Amber</b>	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS- Red</b> The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Although there is some adjoining residential development this site is detached from any substantial area of settlement	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access, however improvements may be difficult to secure as visibility splays are over third party land. No footway provision likely to be achievable.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Active commercial site with structures and substantial hardstanding which would require removal	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties adjoin site to east, otherwise agricultural land immediately adjoins site. Large commercial site further to the east however it is unlikely to preclude residential development of this site.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Substantial hedging and some large trees on western boundary. Northern boundary is also well vegetated and hedge on southern boundary.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedges on boundaries. Little potential within 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)	Potential contamination and infrastructure from existing use.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is well contained by boundary planting with little public views of site.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable due to remote location from main settlement and services, and loss of commercial site	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		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	5 – 10 years. The promoter has identified that the current commercial uses are to remain for the time being as it is anticipated the lease will be in place at least until circa 2021.	Amber

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability. They have also noted that there may be abnormal costs affecting viability from removing hardstanding on the site	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Environmental benefits for neighbouring residential properties from removal of commercial use	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated. Access constraints have been identified where third-party land may be required to achieve visibility. The site is also currently in commercial use which has existing leases in place; justification would be required to demonstrate that the use is no longer required.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Well screened site in current commercial use that is remote from the main part of the settlement with restricted access.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside and removed from the development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available, but there may be a delay in delivery due to the existing commercial uses on the site.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. Whilst the site is considered as brownfield, which is predominantly encouraged, the site is considered remote from the main part of the settlement, where footway provision likely to be achievable. It has also been highlighted that whilst the site benefits from an existing access via Little Melton Road, improvements may be difficult to secure as visibility splays are over third-party land. It is also noted that the site is currently being used for commercial use, where current leases are still active; the development of the site could result in the loss of an employment site.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN0488

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0488
Site address	Land north of School Lane (between No115 and No117), Little Melton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development along the site frontage
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.02 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocated site, numbers not defined
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Possibility of creating a suitable access is constrained</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber</b> Not ideal, would need f/w across site frontage and westwards within highway to connect with existing facility, may need carriageway realignment.</p> <p><b>Updated NCC comments</b> Reasonable verges with no footways – would need to be widened and include footpaths. Poor visibility – this would need to be confirmed and demonstrated that adequate visibility at junction can be achieved, prior to accepting any development off School Lane.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Distance to Little Melton Primary School 700 metres, mainly with footways but no footway along section of School Lane east of junction with Green Lane</p> <p>Distance to bus service 230 metres</p> <p>Distance to shop 400 metres</p> <p>Local employment 1.8km</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Distance to Little Melton village hall and recreation ground 1.6km</p> <p>Distance to The Village Inn public house 650 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewerage infrastructure will need to be upgraded	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site under consideration for fibre technology	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified area at surface water flood along highway and site frontage	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	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>In Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone. No loss of high grade agricultural land.</p> <p><b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER -</b>  Within the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone which has a policy requirement to retain openness – other development proposals have been resisted within this zone – however the sites are well screened; SN0488 has a roadside hedgerow that would require assessment.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Estate development would not be in keeping with form and character this part of School Lane	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local road network is constrained</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agricultural and residential but with A47 to north-east	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of western part of site could be accommodated without extending any further than extent of development to the west of the site	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access may be achievable, but would need footway provision along School Lane. NCC Highways also state that carriageway realignment may be requirement	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land, no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to west and on either side along School Lane. Agricultural land to north and A47 entering cutting, which may need noise mitigation measures	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Land rises to the north	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees on highway boundary other than at field access. Northern boundary is undefined as part of larger field.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on site 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 of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views from field access across site and wider field to A47 cutting.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Some potential to develop western half of site for between 12 and 25 dwellings if highway improvements are achievable and flooding issues along School Lane can be mitigated against. However any development will erode the Bypass Landscape Protection Zone.	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone	Site is entirely within zone	
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site would conflict with the aspirations of the policy protecting the Bypass Landscape Protection Zone	Amber



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

The site is suitable for allocation subject to being reduced in size, between 12 and 25 dwellings. However, the site is also subject to highway constraints that need to be addressed prior to accepting development of the site. The site is also located within the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone, where there is policy requirement to retain openness. Existing surface water flood issues have also been highlighted.

### Site Visit Observations

School Lane is a constrained road that has been severed by the A47 and does not have the benefit of footways. Development consists of limited frontage development in a linear pattern along the north side of the road. However, there is some potential for development on the western half of the site where it will match the extent of development along Green Lane which also includes some backland development.

### Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary. The site is entirely within the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone.

### Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

### Achievability

No further constraints identified.

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a **REASONABLE** option for allocation, subject to a reduction in both the scale of the site and achieving a satisfactory access and highway requirements. NCC Highway Authority have raised site access concerns; the site is accessed via School Lane which is a constrained road that would need to be widened and include footpaths. Poor visibility has also been identified and it would need to be demonstrated that adequate visibility at the junction can be achieved, prior to accepting any further development off School Lane. In addition, any loss of hedgerow along the verge would need to be assessed prior to removal. Whilst the site is relatively well screened, the site is also located within the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone where existing local plan policy requirements set to retain openness, any scheme would need to take this into consideration and justify any erosion of this protection zone. Surface Flood has been identified to the site frontage and highway, however it is considered that this could be mitigated.

### Preferred Site:

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN0591

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0591
Site address	Land north of 5A School Lane, Little Melton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.98 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Development of 8 to 10 dwellings, although site is large enough to accommodate a small allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Constrained existing access  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b> Unlikely to be able to achieve acceptable visibility. Could be used as ped/cycle access for GNLPO340	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <b>Part 1:</b> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Distance to Little Melton Primary School 200 metres  Distance to bus service 150 metres  Distance to shop 500 metres  Local employment 750 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Distance to Little Melton village hall and recreation ground 740 metres  Distance to The Village Inn public house 250 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	TBC AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Part of site is at high risk of surface water flood risk.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is contained and would read as part of settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Backland site behind linear frontage development along School Lane	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would introduce estate development on to northern side of School Lane but given estate development to the north-west of the site and recently permitted to the south of School Lane this could be justified	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Very narrow private access between dwellings which is unlikely to be able to support an access to the satisfaction of the highway authority. Would also raise amenity issues with No7 and No9 School Lane.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to south and west, school to east and agricultural land to north. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries are well vegetated	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on 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 of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Visually well contained site with only narrow views from highway	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site not suitable for development due to inadequate access	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		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has acknowledged that affordable housing may be required but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is of sufficient size for a small allocation. Part of the site is located within an area of high risk of surface water flood. The site is also heavily constrained where access to the site is between existing residential properties, where highway concerns have been raised.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Inadequate access both in terms of its size and its position passing close to Nos 7 and 9 School Lane. Site itself is well contained, although impact on boundary trees would need to be considered.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints have been identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation or inclusion in settlement limit due to inadequate access and high surface water food flood risk across part of the site. Whilst the site is reasonably well located, with the School located immediately adjacent, access to the site is via a very narrow private access between dwellings where a satisfactory access is not achievable. It is also considered that the location of an access here, between residential dwellings would raise concerns with amenity issues with No7 and No9 School Lane.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN2044

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2044
Site address	Land north of Braymeadow Lane, Little Melton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	16 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation – 400 to 500 houses
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Constrained access options onto Braymeadow Lane  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS- Amber</b>  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS (meeting Jan 21)</b> Access via Braymeadow Lane – narrow, no footways, constrained to Eastern Lane. 30mph immediately adjacent to where site access is. Improvements to site frontages relatively easy, however large Oak trees to boundary. Potential issues with encouraging more traffic to head east to county lane. Potential shortlisted if could achieve solutions off Braymeadow Lane- maximise any improvements.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	<p>Distance to Little Melton Primary School 520 metres</p> <p>Distance to bus service 380 metres</p> <p>Distance to shop 560 metres</p> <p>Local employment?</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Distance to Little Melton village hall and recreation ground 1.4km</p> <p>Distance to The Village Inn public house 470 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	To be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Historic landfill site to the north of the site which could pose contamination risks	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Small areas of surface water flooding across 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 with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		C1 Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Partly within Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone No loss of high grade agricultural land.  <b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER -</b> Significant number of roadside trees in closest proximity to the existing development; Braymeadow Lane has fewer arboricultural restrictions closer to the junction with Colney Lane	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development would not have good connectivity with existing development to west	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Site to south	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed Manor House to north of site  <b>NCC HES - Amber</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local highway network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS- Red</b> The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Only part of site that could conceivably be developed in townscape terms would be the area of land to the south-east of Braymeadow and Greenacres. Development of this part of the site would not affect the listed Manor House.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways raise concerns over standard of local road network and lack of footway. Footway along Braymeadow Lane doesn't connect to site and may be difficult to achieve due to position of tree	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to the west, agricultural land on most other boundaries. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Area that would lend itself to development is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees along boundary with Braymeadow Lane. Belt of trees along northern and eastern boundaries.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on 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 existing infrastructure or contamination on area of site that lends itself to development. Consideration will need to be given to former landfill site to north of site.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from Braymeadow Lane	Not applicable



Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site has some constraints due to access and connectivity but has some potential to be considered further if these constraints can be overcome	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone	Northern half of site is within the zone, the southern half is outside	
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site potentially conflicts with the aspirations of the policy protecting the Bypass Landscape Protection Zone depending on the scale and location of development within the site	Amber

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is much larger than the scale of development currently being sought, however a small part of the site could be allocated for 12 to 25 dwellings. It is noted that the northern half of the site is within the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone. Further constraints have been identified with access/highway and heritage.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Wider site is excessive and not suitable for development, but a portion of it adjoining existing development on Braymeadow and Greenacres might be achievable. However, connectivity is not ideal with the existing development and there may be difficulties in achieving the necessary footway links.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary. The northern half of the site is within the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The wider site is significantly too large in the context of the Village Clusters document therefore, subject to a reduction in size and scale of up to 25 dwellings, the site would be considered a **REASONABLE** option for allocation. The land considered acceptable for development is the land adjoining existing development on Braymeadow and Greenacres to the west. Highway constraints have been identified; access via Braymeadow Lane is narrow and would require widening, including the provision of a footway, therefore the site would be subject to achieving satisfactory access. In light of this, it has also been identified that there is significant number of roadside trees in closest proximity to the existing development.

### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 30 November 2020

## SN3001

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3001
Site address	Land to the south of Great Melton Road, Little Melton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.9 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocation – 30 to 35 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access options are constrained.  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber</b> Access could be achieved at Gt Melton Rd but would require c/w widening to 5.5m min and 2.0m wide f/w at site frontage. Would also require f/w to connect with existing facilities along with further c/w widening, doesn't appear feasible within highway.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Little Melton Primary School 480 metres  Distance to bus service 230 metres  Distance to shop 780 metres  Local employment 1km	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Distance to Little Melton village hall and recreation ground 820 metres  Distance to The Village Inn public house 530 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is partly within the identified ORSTED cable route	Amber
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Central area of site is at risk of surface water flooding	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development of site would not erode settlement pattern or be intrusive into open landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Development of the site could respect existing form and character	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Non-designated heritage assets to east  <b>NCC HES - Amber</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local highway network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS - Red</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site could be achieved without resulting in significant harm to the townscape. Whilst there is no existing estate development immediately accessed off Great Melton Road, there is estate development to the rear of the existing linear development on the northern side of the road. Any development on the site would not extend any further south than the adjacent development along Burnthouse Lane.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be achieved onto Great Melton Road, although NCC Highways require footway provision and carriageway widening which they caution may not be achievable	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Site is a paddock with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north and east, agricultural land to south and west. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging on most boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Not within site, potential habitat on site 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 of existing infrastructure or contamination	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	Views across site from Great Melton Road	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of site could be achieved in form and character terms, however flood risk and routing of power cables for offshore wind turbines preclude development on the site	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		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	NCC Highways would require carriageway widening and footway to connect to existing footways which may be difficult to achieve	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Development of the site could be achieved in terms of form and character, but other issues preclude development of the site.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints have been identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. The site is heavily constrained to a small area that is considered developable. A large part of the western side of the site is affected by high risk surface water flooding. It has also been identified that the ORSTED cable route crosses the site, which is the underground routing of power cables for offshore wind turbines. Whilst access could be achieved via Gt Melton Rd this would require c/w widening to 5.5m min and 2.0m wide f/w at site frontage. The site would also require a footway and further widening which doesn't appear feasible within the existing highway. It is considered that any significant landscape harm can be mitigated.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 30 November 2020

## SN3007

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3007
Site address	Land adj Willow Cottage, 7 School Lane, Little Melton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Majority of site is outside the development boundary
Planning History	No planning history since approval of dwelling to front of site (2006/0428 and 2008/0913)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.99 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Market housing – no further details provided
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access would be very constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber</b> Unlikely to be able to achieve acceptable visibility. Could be used as ped/cycle access for GNLPO340	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Little Melton Primary School 200 metres  Distance to bus service 150 metres  Distance to shop 500 metres  Local employment 750 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Little Melton village hall and recreation ground 740 metres  Distance to The Village Inn public house 250 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Much of site is at risk of surface water flooding	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is contained within settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Backland site behind linear frontage development along School Lane	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity  <b>NCC HES - Amber</b>	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS - Red</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would be backland development in area of frontage development	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Would involve creation of narrow access close to the existing dwelling raising amenity issues	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to south and west and agricultural land to north. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries are well vegetated	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Pond in site as well potential habitat in 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 of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Visually well contained site	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site not suitable for development due to inadequate access	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		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has acknowledged that affordable housing could be required but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is sufficient size for a settlement limit extension. Highway constraints have been identified.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Rear garden area to property with pond. Development would be backland development involving unsatisfactory access raising amenity issues.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Partly within but mainly outside the development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is **UNREASONABLE** for a settlement limit extension. Whilst the site is located within a residential context and neighbours the primary School, the site is backland development. Where development here would be out of keeping with the exiting settlement pattern, requiring a convoluted access and with potential amenity concerns for existing residents. The site is also constrained to developable land as the a large part of site has been identified as medium- high risk of surface flood.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

## SN4052

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4052
Site address	Land south of School Lane and east of Manor Farm Barns, Little Melton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocation – 25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Possibility of creating a suitable access is constrained.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber</b> Subject to acceptable visibility at access. School La appears narrow with no f/w poor vis at junction with Green Lane.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS (update from meeting)</b></p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Distance to Little Melton Primary School 650 metres, mainly with footways but no footway along section of School Lane east of junction with Green Lane</p> <p>Distance to bus service 180 metres</p> <p>Distance to shop 350 metres</p> <p>Local employment 1.8km</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Distance to Little Melton village hall and recreation ground 1.6km  Distance to The Village Inn public house 600 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewerage infrastructure will need to be upgraded AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface water flood risk along highway	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> )		C1 Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>In Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone. No loss of high grade agricultural land.</p> <p><b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER-</b>  Within the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone which has a policy requirement to retain openness. Well screened.  SN4052 is more open within the landscape but does not have any significant arboricultural issues.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Other than barn complex to west there is no existing development on the southern side of this section of School Lane	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Manor Farm Barns to west can be considered a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p><b>NCC HES - Amber</b></p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local road network is constrained</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS - Red</b></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would introduce new development on to the southern side of School Lane and potentially have an adverse impact on heritage assets to the west	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No Highways comments, however likely to be similar to SN0488 where access may be achievable, but would need footway provision along School Lane. NCC Highways also state that carriageway realignment may be requirement	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Manor Farm Barns to west has been converted to residential use and there are residential properties on the other side of School Lane to the north. Otherwise agricultural land. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Land rises to the south	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Some hedging along highway boundary with a couple of large trees. Other boundaries are undefined as part of larger field.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on 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 of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from School Lane	Not applicable



Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Possible site for development, depending on access being achievable and subject to the views of the Senior Heritage and Design Officer	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)
Norwich Policy Area		
Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone	Site is entirely within the zone	
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site would conflict with the aspirations of the policy protecting the Bypass Landscape Protection Zone	Amber

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Footway provision along School Lane and possible carriageway realignment	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Additional land available to be given to the parish council or other local body for community use as open space / recreation / woodland / orchard / allotments	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated, subject to achieving satisfactory access. Highway and heritage constraints have been identified. The site is also located within the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone which seeks to protect openness.

### Site Visit Observations

School Lane is a constrained road that has been severed by the A47 and does not have the benefit of footways. Development consists of limited frontage development in a linear pattern along the north side of the road. Development of this would therefore introduce development on to an undeveloped side of the road. It would be adjacent to a converted barn complex to the west, but this may have setting of heritage asset implications.

### Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary. The site is entirely within the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone.

### Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

### Achievability

No further constraints identified.

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered a **REASONABLE** option for allocation.

The site is located to the south of School Lane where there are reasonable verges but no footways, the road would need to be widened and include footpaths. It would also need to be demonstrated that sufficient visibility splays can be achieved, prior to accepting development is acceptable. Whilst the site is located within a residential context, located to the west is Manor Farm Barns which is considered a non-designated heritage asset, the impact of the setting would need to be considered. In landscape terms, the site is relatively open where the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone seeks to protect openness. The site does not have any significant arboricultural issues.

**Preferred Site:** Yes

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 30 November 2020

SN4058

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4058
Site address	Land west of Burnthouse Lane, Little Melton (south of SN4072)
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Numerous historical refusals of planning applications for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.21 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – two dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access constrained by nature of road  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS - Red</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Distance to Little Melton Primary School 400 metres  Distance to bus service 150 metres  Distance to shop 700 metres  Local employment 500 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Distance to Little Melton village hall and recreation ground 750 metres  Distance to The Village Inn public house 450 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site under consideration for upgrade to fibre technology	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some surface water flood risk in 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	Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development protrude south of established southern extent of development. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Detached from main settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage sites in close proximity  <b>NCC HES - Amber</b>	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS - Red</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural land	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of this site alone would be detached from the existing pattern of development, however with the site SN4072 it would continue the existing pattern of development, albeit extending beyond the existing southern extent of the settlement along Burnthouse Lane	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access potential may be constrained due to the nature of the road in this location – would need NCC Highways if the site were to be progressed	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural land to west and to east, although this has permission for residential development. Small pocket of woodland to south. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees on highway and southern boundaries. Western boundary is relatively open	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat potential in hedging and trees and also in vegetation on 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 existing infrastructure or contamination on site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views of site are limited due to planting on boundary but some views across site are possible from north across site SN4072	Not applicable



Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Would extend pattern of development into countryside leading to erosion of rural character and removal of planting that gives this section of Burnthouse Lane a wooded character	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		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Footway provision may be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Affordable housing would not be required	n/a
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is of a suitable size to be included in a settlement limit extension if with site SN4072. Landscape and highway constraints have been identified.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site has well vegetated boundary with Burnhouse Lane that helps gives this section of road a wooded character. Development of this would erode that and extend development south beyond the existing extent of development.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside and slightly detached from the development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints have been identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** option for a settlement limit extension. Development of the site would result in a poor relationship with existing development, both in terms of form and connectivity. Development of the site would also impact on the rural character of the southern end of the village, by eroding the dense woodland setting along Burnhouse Lane. The site is also at the limits of accessibility to services in terms of distance, a problem which is exacerbated by the lack of footways.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 30 November 2020